

# THE MONTH

## A CATHOLIC MAGAZINE



NO. 538 (NEW SERIES 148) APR., 1909

### CONTENTS

THE CATHOLIC FEDERATION OF LONDON.

*By the Hon. Charles Russell* 337

THE FREE CHURCH COUNCIL MEETING.

*By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith* 345

"MY CATHOLIC SOCIALIST." A Dialogue.....*By R. P. Garrold* 360

MAN AND MONKEY .....*By the Editor* 372

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE POOR LAWS. A Catholic  
View.....*By T. G. King, K.S.G.* 381

THE DREAM OF GERONTIUS AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF  
ST. THOMAS .....*By the Rev. T. A. Newsome* 391

SOULS FOR SALE.....*By Grace V. Christmas* 403

FLOTSAM AND JETSAM..... 410

Catholics and the Press.

A Fleur de Lys and Two Godons.

True Continuity of Doctrine.

Ven. Father da Silveira, S.J., and the Zimbabwe Ruins.

REVIEWS ..... 425

SHORT NOTICES ..... 441

BOOKS RECEIVED ..... 446

SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS ..... 448

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO  
LONDON & ONE SHILLING

# STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

---

## PSYCHOLOGY:

Empirical and Rational.

BY

MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., D.Lit.; M.A. LOND.

SIXTH EDITION.

(SEVENTEENTH TO NINETEENTH THOUSAND.)

PRICE 6s. 6d.

---

1. **Logic.** By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J., formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford. Second Edition. Price 5s.
  2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J., late Professor of Logic and General Metaphysics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Fourth Edition. Price 5s.
  3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., M.A. Lond.; late Professor of Ethics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
  4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J., Professor of Natural Theology at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.
  6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Second Edition. Price 5s.
  7. **Political Economy.** By CHARLES S. DEVAS, M.A. Oxon. Sometime Examiner in Political Economy at the Royal University of Ireland. Third Edition. Revised and Enlarged. (Seventh to Ninth Thousand). Price 7s. 6d.
- 

LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta.







## *The Catholic Federation of London.*

---

THE Catholic Federation of London was formed in the autumn of 1906 for the purpose of drawing together into one organization all Catholics, men and women, of every political party and of every social degree. It has now many thousands of members and a branch in nearly every parish. Similar Federations have been formed in all the big centres of England, and are now, it is hoped, about to be united into one great Catholic Confederation of England.

Up to the present time the Catholic laity have had no organization of defence, nor have they had any organization embracing all sections and localities. There are, of course, admirable societies amongst us for every purpose of piety or charity; but these have not branches in every parish, and they include few, comparatively, in their ranks. In London, with the exception of the reception held by the Archbishop in Low Week, and the annual dinner of the Benevolent Society of the Aged Poor, there is no annual meeting where Catholics, drawn from all parts of London, unite; and attendance at these important festivals is, in point of numbers, far from adequate.

It was essential, therefore, if Catholics were to hold their own, that, sooner or later, some organization such as the Catholic Federation should be formed. In every sphere of active effort, concentration and organization form one main factor of success.

The whole history of modern life reveals this truth. We see it in business, in the daily increasing trusts, amalgamations, and combinations. The political world exhibits the same lesson in the party organizations, whether Conservative, Liberal, or Labour. In each case the same process has been going on for the same reason; because union means economy of effort, time, and money, and, therefore, aids success. This applies not only to the great political organizations, but to the various sections of opinion which exist and take their members from all parties. Thus we have societies, such as the Anti-Vivisection Society, the Minority Representation Society, the Bi-Metallists' League, the Liberation Society, and countless

other groups, not forming fresh political parties, but instituted for the purpose of focussing more efficiently the views of their members. This mode of procedure is found to be effective and convenient, both by these societies themselves and by our legislators. The societies are better able to spread information and gather support; the politician knows to whom to address himself; the party organizers, approaching the matter from another standpoint, are able to gauge more speedily the extent to which opinions are held and what force there is behind them in the shape of organization and votes.

If Catholics were never the subject of any special legislation, if their interests, as Catholics, were never directly and specially affected by the making or by the administration of the law, there might be some grounds for saying that separate organization was not needed; but, there are—as we shall show later—many subjects of legislation and matters of administration which directly affect us, and are of particular interest to us.

It may be urged, however, that Catholics stand in an unique position which renders such an organization unnecessary in their special case, because, in the House of Lords, they have a large number of Catholic Peers, men of high reputation, to represent their views, and in the House of Commons there are the Catholic Members from Ireland, always ready to exert their great gifts of statesmanship and eloquence in defence of the religion to which they are so much attached; and, over and above all this, there is an united Hierarchy of Bishops who know their mind and are never afraid to speak it.

All this is undoubtedly true, but there has hitherto been entirely lacking any organization which can show politicians what force, in the shape of votes, there is behind these leaders. There has been no organization through which Catholic voters can as a body make their voices heard and their feelings understood. There has been no body which in each constituency can watch the conduct of the Member of Parliament and bring him, if need be, to book.

The plan upon which the Federation is formed is well calculated to further its objects. In every parish a branch of the Association is formed. These branches are brought together in one Association in each electoral area. The electoral areas are, in turn, united by sending representatives to a Central Council of the Federation. Such Central Council, therefore, directly represents each parish in London, and is fully qualified to express the views of the Catholic community as a whole.

The resolutions of this Central Council on all important matters are under the direct consideration of our Archbishop, and thus complete union and harmony are secured.

Besides being able to accomplish this good object, the Federation may fulfil two other purposes. First of all, it will bring Catholic laymen into touch with each other, and will teach them to know each other better. The want of acquaintance between Catholics, one with another, in London is extraordinary. It is not merely the laymen who are not acquainted, but there are a considerable number of the clergy who are practically strangers to each other, although living at comparatively short distances. Greater union and friendliness amongst Catholics will develop a corporate feeling which should be invaluable.

Another result is that the Catholic layman will gradually learn that he has public, as well as private, duties. As we shall see presently, the smallness of the number of Catholics who take part in public life is astonishing. It cannot be from lack of ability, because, no matter to what profession we turn, whether it be to the Army or Navy, or to the medical or legal professions, the Civil Service or the Press, Catholics play leading parts. We have had, and have, great generals, eminent judges, distinguished doctors, successful civil servants and writers. This backwardness in public life is due to a kind of survival amongst us of the "Penal taint;" a fear that prejudice against our religion is fatal to success; a kind of idea that the good things of life are not for Catholics. The fact is that Catholics have been so long out of public life that they have lost the tradition of it, and the young man with any public ambition stirring in his heart knows not how to set about claiming his rights as a citizen. He is afraid of opening his mouth in public and of coming forward and taking that position to which his talents entitle him.

There are many signs of a desire that the present state of things should end. At every election there appear more young Catholics as candidates for Parliamentary honours. Every municipal election sees more Catholics, each in his own district, aiming at serving the municipality. Every school of any importance has now its debating society carried on on Parliamentary lines, while the sanction, under due safeguards, of Catholics joining the Universities, brings our most talented youths into the full stream of the national life.

But is the machinery of the Catholic Federation too large or

too ambitious for the object in view? Certainly not. Few Catholics realize the great Niagara of Catholic strength in London which is running to waste. The machinery of the Catholic Federation is designed to harness and utilize that power.

I have elsewhere publicly stated that every eleventh man, woman, and child whom we meet in the streets of London is Catholic, and this statement, surprising though it may sound, can be justified.<sup>1</sup> This would make the total number of Catholics in London no less than 400,000. This figure shows the magnitude of the interests which Catholics have at stake in the public affairs of London.

We may now consider the nature of these interests, especially in relation to the various great public bodies who make and administer our laws.

So far as the Imperial Parliament is concerned, it has never been in the mind of anybody to form a Catholic Party; such a course is too absurd to discuss. The only questions on which Catholics should act as a body are questions which vitally affect their Faith; and we may hope that occasions for any intervention will be few and far between.

The rules which should govern such necessary intervention, it is submitted, should be:

- (1) That it should only take place when some really vital question is at stake.
- (2) That the object aimed at should not be to support the party which is prepared to offer us most, but to ensure that both the great parties should bring their legislation up to what for us is essential.
- (3) That as regards things which are not essential there should be absolute liberty for each individual to vote as he thinks right.

Any other course would, in my opinion, in the end, tend to alienate us permanently from one or other party in the State, whilst our aim should be to have as many friends as possible in both camps. Any attempt to enforce unity of action on matters not essential merely because one party or the other was thought to be more friendly, or because such party was prepared to bid a little higher for support, would unduly strain allegiance, and lead to ultimate disruption.

There are several questions of practical Parliamentary politics which claim the attention of Catholics.

<sup>1</sup> For the figures, see *Catholics and Public Life*, by Hon. Charles Russell (Burns and Oates, Ltd.).

There is the question of the Royal Declaration, whereby his Majesty the King is compelled, quite unnecessarily, to insult the religion of ten millions of his subjects.

There is the question of the degrading exclusion of Catholics from certain high offices of the State which, nevertheless, are open to members of any other religion or non-religion, be they Hindu, Jew, Nonconformist, or Atheist.

There is, over and above all other questions, the question of education, wherein our claim is that a Catholic parent is entitled to have given to his children, out of the public funds to which he contributes so largely, a religious education of which his conscience can approve.

If we are to keep this right, which has been confirmed to us by so many Acts of Parliament, relying upon which Acts we have spent upon our schools four millions of money, it can only be done at the price of incessant vigilance and effective organization.

Whilst re-affirming the view that the intervention of Catholics as a body in Imperial politics should be rare, it is impossible to pass from the subject without commenting upon the shockingly small number of Catholic Members of Parliament representing British constituencies. If the Catholics of Great Britain were represented in the House of Commons in proportion to their numbers there would be thirty Catholic Members. There are, in fact, only four.

We now come to humbler institutions. London is governed by three great bodies, viz. :

- (1) Boards of Guardians,
- (2) Borough Councils, and
- (3) The County Council.

The Boards of Guardians have the exclusive power to carry out the Poor Laws and to relieve the destitute, either by giving out-door relief or by receiving the paupers in workhouses. They contract for the food, clothing, fuel, &c., supplied to the workhouses and infirmaries, and control of these institutions. With them must be grouped the Metropolitan Asylums Board and Sick Asylums managers, because these two bodies consist of members elected by the various Boards of Guardians and of certain members nominated by the Local Government Board. The Asylums Board deals not only with imbeciles, but carries on the Infectious Diseases Hospital, seaside homes and schools for children, homes for defective children, the training-ship *Exmouth* off Grays, an ophthalmic hospital, and a ringworm

school, whilst the Sick Asylums managers are charged with the care of sick paupers not provided for by workhouse infirmaries.

It need not be pointed out that in the various great institutions which are under the care of the Boards of Guardians, either directly or indirectly, there are a vast number of Catholics, not merely as inmates and patients, but as employés, and we have, therefore, a great and direct interest that members of our community (it matters not to what side in politics they belong) should take a share in the public life relating to these bodies.

As a matter of fact, we can claim but fifty out of 824 Guardians in the Metropolis; whereas, if a just proportion were maintained as to population, the number of Catholic Guardians should be about seventy-three.

The work done by our fifty Catholic Guardians is admirable, but great is the need for more. For example, in one London district where there are two Catholic churches, and where thirty-three per cent. of the paupers in the workhouse are Catholics, we have not a single Catholic Guardian! In another district, where there are eighty-eight Catholics in the workhouse, there is not a single Catholic Guardian. In this latter case a Catholic Guardian is sadly needed, for the Catholic paupers are being treated in an unfair and bigoted manner.

This neglect, so far as it is remediable, is not creditable to the Catholic clergy or laity.

We next come to the Borough Councils, with their Mayors, Aldermen, and Councillors. There are twenty-nine such Councils.

These Borough Councils are the local sanitary authorities for London, and deal with the construction and maintenance of all sewers and drains (except main drains), sanitary conveniences, factories and workshops, overcrowding, sale of unsound food, the making, maintaining, lighting, watering, cleansing, and regulating of the streets; they provide and manage baths and wash-houses, and control public fountains; they provide public libraries and minor open spaces, and they are the local authorities under the Electric Lighting Act; they also appoint Medical Officers of Health, Sanitary Inspectors, and Analysts.

Nothing can better illustrate the unduly small part played by Catholics in public life than the pointing out that, although Catholics form one-eleventh of the population, out of the 227 Aldermen and 1,362 Councillors who make up the Borough Councils of London, only about a dozen are Catholics.

The next great public body is the London County Council,

whose duties are well known. It administers an area of 121 square miles, and comprises a chairman, nineteen Aldermen, 118 Councillors, making 138 in all. It regulates the main drainage of London, fire brigade, the parks and open spaces, the bridges and tunnels of the Thames, street improvements. It controls the width of the streets, naming and numbering of streets, structure of theatres and music-halls, artisans' dwellings, tramways; the granting of music and dancing licenses; pauper lunatics, reformatories, and industrial schools; the testing of weights and measures; the licensing of theatres, slaughter-houses, and cow-houses; the care of historic buildings and monuments; inspection of factories; the administration of the Shop Hours Act, the Employment of Children Act and the Midwives Act; registration of electors; the registration of motor cars, steamboat service on the Thames. It has delegates upon, and a voice in the administration of, the Water Board and the government of the Thames Conservancy; but, over and above all these, it has to carry out the Education Acts. It has a vast army of engineers, school teachers, medical officers, analysts, surveyors, and every kind of skilled artisan and labourer. It has very large powers of borrowing and raising funds, and of sanctioning loans by Borough Councils.

Although Catholics have, as citizens, a tremendous interest in the work of this body, and especially in the administration of the Education Acts, there is not one single Catholic elected member or Alderman.

There is a manifest desire on the part of the large working-class neighbourhoods to enter thoroughly into the new Catholic movement, and anybody attending the meetings cannot fail to be struck by the business aptitude and the moderation of tone which has gradually developed. The districts in which progress is slower are chiefly Kensington and Marylebone, where there are great numbers of Catholics of the prosperous middle-class. They are afflicted by the paralysis of prosperity, and seem unable to bring themselves into action. The day may be when attacks may be made upon the Church even more violent than that recently attempted against our schools. Such attacks will find the prosperous middle-class unprepared and defenceless. In vain sheep bleat when the wolf has rushed their pleasant pasture.

Then they will discover that organization cannot be developed in a moment, then they will learn that prosperity and respectability without organization will avail them as little



as these qualities have done the Catholics of France in similar situations.

If they now hang back a grave responsibility lies upon them and those who guide them. If they will only, on the other hand, exert themselves and shake off this lethargy and take up their share of public work, they will find their working-men fellow-Catholics only too willing to follow and support them. They will be listened to eagerly, and their voices will carry much greater weight than they themselves suspect. That respect awaits them which the working-man always pays to superior education when he knows the possessor of it to be honest.

Enough has been said to show what an extraordinarily rich field for noble work there is, if only Catholics will come forward and take their share in it. But Catholics must not enter upon the work as mere protectors of Catholic interests. If they do, nobody will listen to them. They must show that they have the interests of the whole community at heart. No man is so unpopular on public bodies as the man who only attends when he has some little axe of his own to grind. They must establish a reputation for solid and unselfish work in all the business of the body they join. Work is an irresistible force, nothing can stop men who work. When they have thus won the respect of their fellow-members, they will be able to protect the interests of their co-religionists.

It will be good for Catholics to associate on equal terms with their fellow-subjects. Their doing so will gradually do away with the strong prejudice which, unfortunately, still exists against Catholics. They will do away with the silly idea that Catholics are a nation within a nation. As members of public bodies Catholics will learn the art of administration, which will be invaluable to them, not only in their private careers, but in the government of their own numerous charitable concerns. Incidentally they will open to their fellow-Catholics a fair share of careers in municipal service now practically closed. They will enlarge the horizon of their outlook on life, and, whilst doing great good to others, they will make their own lives more interesting.

CHARLES RUSSELL.

P.S.—One practical word. Anyone desiring to help the Catholic Federation can do so in two ways (1), by communicating with his parish priest, and becoming a member in the parish, or (2), by subscribing to the head office funds, and sending a subscription to the Secretary of the Catholic Federation, 37, Norfolk Street, Strand, W.C.



### *The Free Church Council Meeting.*

---

IN the early summer of last year the Pan-Anglican Congress was held in London; in the autumn following we held our Eucharistic Congress; and in the second week of last month, a Conference of the Free Church Council was held at Swansea. The first two of these gatherings being international were on a vastly grander scale than the last-named, still they may reasonably be classed together as three nearly simultaneous Congresses, representative of the three main divisions of religious belief in the country. When men of like feeling meet together in impressive numbers, their emotions are stimulated, and they exhibit as it were in a magnified form the special spirit which characterizes them. We have then in the three Congresses an opportunity of comparing and contrasting the spirits which animate the Anglican, the Catholic, and the Nonconformist bodies.

We may be thought biassed witnesses if we claim for the Eucharistic Congress that its spirit was throughout a spirit of love and charity towards all men. Yet that undoubtedly was a feature in the Congress which impressed not only those who took part in it, but numbers of outside observers as well. Its members were indeed as exclusive in one sense as Catholics always must be, for they do not believe in the absurdity that one religion is as good as another, and have embraced the Catholic religion, often at the cost of the severest sacrifices, in the conviction that it bears on its face the clearest signs that it, and it only, is the religion established by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. But in another sense there is no limit to Catholic inclusiveness, for wherever Catholics find human hearts aspiring after the good and the true, particularly wherever they find hearts solicitous to love and serve our Lord Jesus Christ, it is natural to them, and delightful to them, to recognize and claim a moral and spiritual kinship. And this

spirit, without being in any way formally prescribed, by a common instinct pervaded all the meetings of the Congress. There were frequent acknowledgments of the tolerance and friendliness shown them by the English people and its rulers. The sermons, speeches, discussions, and resolutions, bore almost exclusively on the means of deepening the spiritual life in clergy and people. The controversial note was unheard throughout, even the discussion on the King's Declaration taking the form of an appeal to the English people to have courage to do away with an outrage which they themselves, at least the great mass of them, deplored as not less superfluous than it is uncharitable. It is true there was a note of discord towards the end over the character of the Procession. But there the provocation came from without, and originated in the threats of some unscrupulous bigots to make the carrying of the Sacred Host an occasion for sacrilege; besides it was met by the Catholic Archbishop and his people with a dignity and self-restraint that won general admiration.

In the Pan-Anglican gathering the same spirit of charity towards all men was conspicuous. To others, as to ourselves, some of their ideals have appeared impracticable because based on the unsound principles essential to the Anglican position. But it was impossible not to be deeply and sympathetically impressed by the spectacle of so many earnest men from all parts concordant in the desire to make God known to men of all races, and to spend their lives in the endeavour; passionately anxious, too, to work, according to their lights and opportunities, to remove the foul scandal of Christian disunion. Their references, moreover, to those separated from them, or in disagreement with them, were throughout courteous and friendly; were, in short, those of Christian gentlemen.

It would be pleasant were it possible to speak in like terms of the Nonconformist gathering at Swansea. Of multitudes of Nonconformist ministers and laymen throughout the kingdom it is easy so to speak. Their lives are most edifying, their piety worthy of all praise. Oftentimes we can recognize this, and do gladly recognize it, even in those who are prejudiced against us by the mendacious literature which circulates among them; especially in those among them who, their prejudices against our doctrines notwithstanding, are so genial and charitable in their dealings with us. But the Free Church Council people appear to be of quite another sort. Indeed, so great is the

divergence, if one is to judge of the recent Congress from the newspaper reports of it, that we feel it a duty to modify somewhat the words with which this article commenced, and to accept the Swansea meeting as representative not of Nonconformity generally, but of a particular type of it which is unhappily seeking to acquire a dominative influence over the whole body.

The Free Church Council was, we believe, first instituted in 1893. Its idea was to remove in some degree the reproach of Nonconformist divisions by emphasizing the points about which the various sects were agreed, and on this basis giving them a common organization which they could use for the furtherance of the spiritual objects they were united in desiring. The National Council is formed of members elected not denominationally but territorially (so as "to avoid sectarian distinction and avoid the possibility of committing separate Churches to any particular policy") by the Local Councils; and an Executive Committee, elected by the National Council at the annual Congress, is entrusted with the administration of the whole organism. Had the Free Church Council been faithful to this original idea of a step towards reunion, its career would have been worthy of general sympathy. But one of the objects stated in the *prospectus* was "to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of life," and this object, in itself suitable enough, was quickly interpreted to mean that the Council would "take concerted action on questions affecting their common interests, as bearing on the social, moral, and religious welfare of the people." That raised the suspicions of Dr. Dale, of Birmingham, a leading Nonconformist personality at that time. He was conscious of the political propensities of some of his brethren, and judged that any such organization for concerted political action must result in "transforming the Free Church Councils into political and municipal caucuses." Accordingly, as his colleagues persisted in their scheme, he found it necessary to dissociate himself from their movement altogether. The result has shown that his anticipations were well-founded, and there is a growing dissatisfaction among the more spiritually-minded Nonconformists at the turn things are taking among them. A book that has just appeared under the title of *Nonconformity and Politics*, by a "Nonconformist Minister," has given forcible expression to this feeling of dissatisfaction. Viewed from a literary standpoint, it is not a well-written

book. The writer repeats himself *ad nauseam*, yet without being able clearly to grasp and express his thought. Still, if the style be condoned, the testimony is valuable, for it shows how a really earnest man, though dominated by all the prejudices and narrow-mindedness common among his sort, chafes under the prevailing scandal.

For its devotion to political affairs [he writes] and its neglect of the eternal interests committed to its charge, Nonconformity must pay—and is, whether it realize the fact or not, paying heavily to-day. Underneath all the loud-tongued voices through which Nonconformity contributes its share to the political discussions of the time . . . there is going on a process of weakening and decay whereby Nonconformity is losing both love for its proper work and capability for doing it. . . . And Nonconformity, in its awakening, must surely flush with shame to think that, while for many a year it has been making numerous and ardent politicians, it has made scarcely any saints. For this is the brief and accurate summing-up of the situation—and its bitter irony too. . . .

As soon as he has entered, a Church member is reckoned upon as one who will support any political resolution that may be brought forward, and who, being inspired by the "Nonconformist conscience," will assuredly take the dominant Nonconformist political line. And all over the country (the writer speaks those things which he has heard and seen) there are those who, having once belonged to some Nonconformist church, have dropped out of membership because their political opinions have made a real severance between them and their fellows in the house of prayer. . . .

The minister who, remembering the one object for which all Churches exist, seeks to devote himself to it, is looked upon askance, as the present writer knows full well. There is hardly any place for such a man in the Nonconformity of to-day. . . . The men whom the Churches most care to hear now—the men whom the official representatives of the various denominations most delight to honour—are the men who speak most loudly upon the current political topics, and who (if it may be said without disrespect) "play to the gallery," and echoing the gallery's political watchwords, rouse the gallery to re-echo them in its turn. . . . Nonconformity turns only with something of an effort—and with an effort it cannot help betraying in measure to any soul of real sensitiveness—to directly spiritual ministries. It is not with these—and one recognizes the fact even while Nonconformist services are endeavouring to embody them and give them force—that Nonconformity is most at home. . . . The spiritual temperature has gone down by many degrees. The forces that make for saintliness are not at work—only pale *simulacra* of them.

On the very eve of the Swansea Congress another witness came forward to bear testimony from within to the lengths to which this substitution of politics for religion is being carried on. We are referring to the letter of "Nonconformist" in the *Times* for March 6th. The style of this writer shows sufficiently that he is not identical with the "Nonconformist Minister" whose words we have been quoting, and his testimony is that Socialism is "pushing Christianity out of [their] Churches," as is evidenced "in every Church where Socialism has gained a footing, and in the dwindling of communicants and Sunday scholars throughout Nonconformity as a whole."

We have now to fight [he continues] a body which, nominally Nonconformist, is really controlled and dominated by Socialists, whose influence, nominally Christian, is primarily Socialistic, which seeks to capture, and in many places has captured, the machinery of our churches for the purposes of Socialism. Look who stands to-day as the recognized Parliamentary spokesman of the Free Church Council! Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P., author of the Right to Work Bill, a piece of purest Socialism, who at the Labour Congress supported a resolution shutting all Christian teaching out of our day schools. That resolution was carried—to the shame of Nonconformity, be it spoken—despite the protest of two Roman Catholic delegates, who, casting politics behind them, refused to deny their faith. Each month Mr. Henderson's own Socialist comrades report the opening of fresh Sunday schools, from which the very name of God is banished. Each year Mr. Henderson's own Free Church Council reports show how Nonconformist Sunday scholars are falling away by the thousand. For a typical case of Free Churchism let Nonconformists look on page 40 of the last report of the West London Sunday School Union, published at 133, Edgware-Road, W., and pick out the biggest church in West London—Whitefield's Tabernacle, from whose pulpit Mr. Henderson and nearly all the leading Socialists have spoken. The best that this huge church can do for the Christian instruction of the young is to provide ten teachers in its Sunday school, only eight of whom are communicants, with no morning Sunday school, an average attendance of eighty-five in the afternoon, and no Band of Hope. By their fruits ye shall know them. . . .

In defence of their Socialism, these Free Church ministers employ against their fellow-Nonconformists exactly the same sneers which Mr. Blatchford levels against all Christianity. Non-Socialist churches are "petty coteries of self-introspective saints," our faiths are "trumpery points of dogma," while the Socialist preachers' own speeches are always "palpitating with great moral issues." The palpitation is there right enough. Their audiences are in no sense local congregations,

but men from all parts who have developed a kind of craze for getting fuddled with fiery speeches once a week, a sort of political dipsomaniacs who get as drunk on words as if they had been drinking brandy. . . .

It is time for Nonconformists to fight against a body which is fighting Nonconformity. That which was "to the Jew a stumbling block, and to the Greek foolishness," still stands for our rallying point against the attack of the Free Church Council.

These quotations are helpful as showing what, in the judgment of the more spiritually minded section which forms the old school among the Nonconformists, is the character and temperament of the people who met together at Swansea for the Conference. We cannot undertake to judge between this critic and those whom he condemns. We can only say that from the reports of the Conference which have been given by the papers, secular and Nonconformist, its proceedings were quite in keeping with this judgment. As one looks down the list of the subjects discussed, one notices that, with a single exception, all relate to the political controversies of the day, and are marked by a Socialistic tendency, and in all the line taken is one of uncompromising and unreasoning condemnation of all who venture to think differently from themselves. Down with the Church of England, down with the denominationalists, down with the Catholics, down with the Unionists, brewers, anti-Socialists, down even with those of their own creed and party who may have ventured to think that some little consideration should be paid to other classes of the community. Such was the pervading note of the Congress.

This may seem a severe judgment, but a glance at some of the proceedings will prove that it is not excessive. On the night previous to the opening, Sir Robert Perks showed his exquisite sense of truthfulness and of charity by allusions to the Anglican Church and to the Catholic Religious Orders. Seeking to ward off from his own people the charge of being wild politicians rather than ministers of religion, he declared that "the Church of England was a political institution from top to bottom," that "every clergyman was a politician," and that that Church had been "built up by taxes and rates wrung from the pockets of the people." And in defence of his sectarianism, he said "he knew of Nonconformist colleagues in the House of Commons who, in their anxiety to avoid what is called the bane of sectarianism, would go into the Lobby to

support the Jesuitical institutions which are now being planted on English soil, and thus in their tolerance take into the nation's bosom the foul and deadly viper which every other nation had sought to expel." It is a matter of common knowledge that Anglican clergymen, with the rarest exceptions, take little or no part in politics, certainly no such violent part as do ministers of the type of Dr. John Clifford or Mr. Silvester Horne; and surely Sir Robert Perks must know that, apart from the comparatively small Church rates—for the maintenance of worship, which have long since been abolished—the Anglican Church has had nothing from the State. That tithes are not "wrung from the pockets of the people" is manifest in the simple fact that in the case of Disestablishment there is no thought of remitting these rates to the tithe-payer. They are a charge on his land which, being taken into account when he bought it, proportionately reduced its price for him, and if the parson who is its present beneficiary is deprived of it, it will be assigned to some national purpose. Of the Church holdings or other endowments, those of post-Reformation origin were not created by grants from the State, but by the private offerings of members of that Church. The pre-Reformation endowments were likewise given by private donors not by the State (unless possibly in exceptional cases). Of course those private offerings were made to Catholics, from whom they were taken by the State at the time of the Reformation and given to the newly-created Anglican Church. Whether that transaction was justifiable or not we need not discuss now, especially as, after all this lapse of time, the modern Catholics make no claim to have them restored; but in any case the endowments in question were never wrung from the pockets of the people. As for the Catholic monasteries and convents, whether peopled by British subjects or exiled foreign subjects, it would have been well if Sir Robert Perks had confessed openly like a man, what is obviously the fact, that he could not produce a scrap of evidence to prove that any one of these had given even the smallest offence to any one whatever; well, too, had he not omitted to mention that, if they have been exiled from their own country, it was by men who likewise never attempted to prove any crime against them, but turned them out of house and home, simply and solely out of hatred for the Christian religion.

On the Tuesday morning, the Rev. Evan Jones, of Carnarvon,



was chosen President, and delivered an introductory address which, owing to the feebleness of his voice, does not appear to have made much impression. After this occurred an episode which was greatly to the credit of the Hon. and Rev. W. Talbot Rice, the Vicar of Swansea, who, accompanied by some of his colleagues, came forward to welcome the Congress on the part of the Anglicans in the town. "He trusted that that Conference and the Church Congress to be held in Swansea later in the year would tend to that godly union and concord the need of which was increasingly felt in face of many forces which were antagonistic to the Kingdom of God." To appreciate the generosity displayed by the Vicar in thus intervening, we must remember that it is his Elementary School which has been lately engaging the attention of Parliament, in view of the harshness with which its teachers have been treated by the Nonconformist majority on the Local Education Committee. For the crime of being teachers in a voluntary school the Committee has been refusing to pay them adequate salaries, and quite recently Mr. Talbot Rice has given £10,000 out of his own private property to prevent his school from being closed on the ground of an inefficiency consequent on this cutting down of salaries. The Conference perfunctorily reciprocated the Vicar's welcome by standing up to receive it, and saying a few complimentary words, but no further outcome of the interchange of civilities was discernible in the subsequent proceedings. The palm of Christian friendliness seems to have been decidedly with the Vicar.

This episode completed, the Education question was taken in hand. Dr. John Clifford brought forward an inordinately long string of Resolutions, the gist of which was that every State or State-aided school without any exception whatever, must be absolutely undenominationalized. Only one system must be permitted, and that altogether homogeneous, on the principle of unlimited public control and management, no tests direct or indirect for teachers, and simple Bible-mangling in the Nonconformist sense everywhere taught—of course with the confiscation of all such funds as members of other religious communities had for the protection of their children's faith accumulated at the cost of frequent and painful sacrifices. It seems that originally these Resolutions had been slightly less drastic, or at least were accompanied by some clause approving of the policy of compromise which the Government, with the



co-operation of some few Nonconformist ministers and Members of Parliament, tried last autumn. But even this slight concession to the principle of equity stirred the bile of the extreme left of these extremists, and a boiling-hot Gospeller of the name of Guttery (the same who, according to the *Times* correspondent, "Nonconformist," recently showed his imagination as well as his irreverence by parodying a specially sacred sentence from the Bible into "they gave us a Tory Government of beer mingled with blood, but we received it not"), successfully insisted that all approvals of compromise, past or future should be deleted and the Resolutions made to stand, as they ultimately did, in their naked intolerance and injustice. This fanatic "did not want such things to happen in the next twelve months as had happened in the last; he wanted to close the doors on contracting out, on right of entry, and on teachers in Council Schools giving denominational teaching; he wanted them to close the door with a bang, to lock it and keep the key. Let the men who unlocked that door take notice that the [Free?] Council was not behind them." Others spoke to the Resolutions, but this was the tone that prevailed, no one venturing to put in a plea for moderation, or reminder that other people besides Nonconformists might claim to have, and actually have, consciences. Such a notion would indeed have seemed to them ridiculous. Were they not the choice flower of Christianity, and was it not for them to decide, not only for themselves but also for others, what measure of bread-crumbs from a table that was rightly theirs might be thrown by way of commiseration to Christians of inferior orders?

Into the midst, however, of their self-complacency over this policy of Thorough, came a bombshell from a quarter whence they had evidently least expected it. The Rev. J. M. Saunders, a Nonconformist minister from the town where they were met together, suddenly sprang up to move an amendment in favour of the secularist solution. "The time had come [it said] when the Government should call on the Churches to undertake entirely the religious instruction of the children." This amendment was seconded by the Rev. Abel Parry, of Rhyl. An attempt was made to prevent its discussion, but the Chairman decided that the mover and his supporters were within their right in bringing it forward. Then the excitement became intense. Dr. Scott Lidgett "made a spirited protest against the amendment, the acceptance of which [he declared] would be

a most remarkable sign of instability of purpose under pressure of controversy." But an apple of discord had been cast into their midst, and by this time it reached the platform. Sir George White described himself as the "arch-fiend of compromise," whatever that meant, and blamed the Nonconformist members in the House of Commons for having exposed their plain issue to these dangers by admitting the spirit of negotiation and compromise—in other words, by conceding that other people's consciences ought to receive some consideration. "He was not prepared to allow the Board of Education to put the Bible under its edict. Secularism would assist Romanism in every possible way, for Romanism had always resisted the placing of the Bible in the hands of the children. There were hundreds of thousands of children who, but for the Bible in the Elementary Schools, would grow up ignorant of the Bible." It did not occur to Sir George White that to speak thus was to acknowledge the inability of the Sunday Schools to bear the chief strain of the religious education of the children, and hence the injustice of forcing the alternative of simple Bible-reading or no religious instruction at all, on those children towards the building up of whose religious beliefs this simple Bible-mangling (for such it is wont to be) contributes no useful element whatever.

But Sir George White's remarks "brought Dr. Campbell Morgan to his feet with the declaration that he was in favour of secular education, but not of the exclusion of the Bible from the schools. 'By all means,' he exclaimed, 'let us have the Bible in all schools, but let us have it without the interpretation either of Dr. Clifford or of the Archbishop of Canterbury.'" Here he illustrated what is so obvious and yet is so strangely unobserved by the advocates of undenominationalism, the impossibility of adhering consistently to the principle of explaining a book without giving it the interpretation you have in your mind. Secularism would say, By all means let us use the Bible in the schoolrooms which all are to attend, but let us use it as literature, on a par with the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*, for the excellent stories which it contains, and from which we can deduce useful moral lessons for the children; only let us take care not to convey the idea that these stories are more than mere legends, still less that their references to God are based on truth. But in practice a secularist teacher would be impelled to go a step further, unconsciously if not consciously, and convey to the children the impression that these stories are

mere fancies of the imagination, and that, though they are free to believe in God, it is foolish to do so. Similarly, a Calvinist teacher would inevitably introduce his own view of man's total depravity, and others to match. Curiously, Sir Robert Perks, who next spoke, gave a practical example of this inevitable impulse. He was indignant at the idea of excluding all comments on the Bible text. "Supposing," he said, "a little boy in a Lincolnshire village comes to school with a black band on his arm. He has lost a little brother, who his mother has told him is now in Heaven; and he asks the teacher where is Heaven. Is the teacher to be forbidden to give him what comfort is in his power, because it is forbidden to explain the Bible? Must he say to the boy, 'I am not allowed to tell you now; you must wait till it is after four o'clock.'" But here Dr. Rendal Harris, of the Society of Friends, took him up, and said: "I want you to think of the same Lincolnshire village. There is another little boy with a black band round his arm. 'Please, teacher,' he exclaims, 'my little brother is dead, and mother says he is in Purgatory. Where is Purgatory?' 'That,' says the teacher, 'is a very proper question, but I am paid for teaching you other things; but if you will only come to me after school hours, I will readily tell you.'" Probably in his heart of hearts Sir Robert Perks thought the cases were not similar; that in his case the teacher and pupils were Nonconformists whose creed should be taken as the rule suitable to be applied to all; but in the other case the teacher and pupils were obnoxious Romanists worthy of no consideration at all. Still, this would not do to say aloud: whereas, if he were to say aloud that Purgatory was not a doctrine common to Catholics and Nonconformists whilst Heaven was, he would have the secularist behind him protesting that neither was Heaven a doctrine common to Christians and Agnostics.

The supporters of this secularist amendment were earnestly solicited to abandon a contention so distasteful, but they refused, and pressed for a division. This led to the discovery that they could only command fifty votes in that large assembly, a discovery which was welcomed by the vast majority with a feeling of relief. They must not, however, suppose that that is the end of the matter. We ourselves shall not be suspected of any leanings towards the secular solution, for we have written against it in this periodical, and have rejected it as inadmissible on exactly the same grounds as the Cowper-

Templeist solution that pleases the Nonconformists. Still, we must confess that as against the Nonconformists the contention of the Secularists is unanswerable. The Nonconformists lay down a principle which they declare they will force on us all. It is that there shall be but one type of State-supported school in the country, and that in this school only those fundamental religious doctrines shall be taught which are held in common by all the denominations in the country. Then come the Agnostics and say, Very well, we accept your principle, but as we do not believe in the Divinity of Christ, the rewards and punishments of an after-life, or the existence of a Personal God, we claim that these doctrines shall not be admitted into the school teaching. Are they not perfectly logical in making this application of the principle?

What then is to be the final outcome of all this controversy? The Free Church Council people are deriving from their proceedings at Swansea a confidence that their own school policy is about to carry the day. Their representatives in Parliament are to be resolutely brought to heel, the Government is to be told plainly that it must, if it is to keep in power, give up parleying with other classes, and take its tune humbly and obediently from their pipes, the House of Lords is to be triumphantly abolished, and Anglicans, Catholics, and Secularists are to be trampled under foot. Well, that is their anticipation, but, if anything can be learnt from the state of the country and the experience of the last few years, that is just the last thing which is likely to happen. The causes which have been operating in Parliament during the last few years will continue to operate, and will therefore continue to prevent the Government from obeying servilely the dictates of their would-be masters. The Agnostics who demand the secular solution are very far indeed from being without numbers and influence, indeed their numbers and influence are increasing with each new generation sent forth from those nurseries of Indifferentism and Agnosticism, the Council Schools with their principle of "No Tests for Teachers." It is this party which must ultimately prevail, if the policy of one homogeneous type of school is to be persisted in. The only possible alternative which under present conditions has any chance of working is that in which a serious attempt is made to do justice to all by sanctioning, as at present, a few types of school, all to receive equal assistance from the State.

Of other episodes of the Congress we must confine our remarks to two, though elsewhere in this number we have commented on the perversities of that erratic person, Mr. Joseph Hocking. Meeting so soon after the publication of the anonymous book and the anonymous letter from which we have given some quotations, it was to be expected that the Council should declare itself on the question of Nonconformity and Politics. Speeches were made by the Revv. F. B. Meyer and C. Silvester Horne which are said by the *Christian World* to have raised the enthusiasm of the hearers to "boiling point." Indeed Mr. Silvester Horne seems to have "stirred it to a white heat" by his fiery speech on "making a kingdom *v.* making saints." It was perhaps imprudent in him under the circumstances to give such points to the anonymous writer, who might claim the exhibition as confirming the description he had given of palpitating orations at Mr. Horne's own chapel, Whitefield's. But one thing was transparent in Mr. Horne's speech. He showed by his wrath that the two writers witness to a considerable cleavage within the Nonconformist ranks, of the presence of which he was well aware.

It seemed [he said] as if the Churches were suffering for the moment from something like an influenza microbe, which seemed in certain quarters to have created physical and moral distress. They have very little to say to their critics without. It was not the foes without, but the foes within, that concerned them. It was a question of what was the destiny, not the mission, of the Free Churches in England. . . . They had no belief in the assumption that to handle politics was to handle pitch, and that to save the soul of the Church they must leave the State alone. . . . Imagine Samuel or Elijah apologizing for taking part in politics! But even if he apologized for Samuel or Elijah he would not apologize for himself. The business of the Church was not to make up a number of the elect—it was to make a Divine commonwealth. He denounced the insidious doctrine that the Church should have nothing to do with politics, as an ignominious betrayal by the Church of her ideal. He held up John Calvin as a man who did noble service by his insistence that the world had no use for a Church that had a Gospel but had not a kingdom. It was the business and it was the duty of the Church of Christ to help to shape the policies of kingdoms and to Christianize the institutions of the State. . . . He believed the Free Churches were predestined in the power of God to break the power of the liquor trade; to save the Church of Christ from secular dominion, and the schools of the people from the yoke of the priest; to end the long, disastrous lease of the land monopoly, and to save the fair fame of Christian civilization from

the shame of the slum and the sweater's den. . . . They might reform the Jews and the Romans, and every empire on earth except their own; but if they began to reform their own, their rich deacons who had cushions and gave subscriptions would transfer their cushions and subscriptions to the nearest "spiritual" church.

These are fine words, but his colleague, the author of *Nonconformity and Politics*, had already pointed out to him the misconception which lurks in them. Politics, truly says his colleague, is usually a question of method rather than of aim. Certain ends are desired by the contending parties on either side, such as that sobriety should prevail, that the conditions of life should be improved for the poor, that all denominations should have equal educational opportunity. But will a particular licensing bill, or taxation of land values bill, or education bill, secure these desirable ends, and secure them without involving evils of a still worse kind? These are points on which there can be difference of opinion among good men. And in their political action good men must be allowed to use their judgment and take their sides accordingly, each party striving according to its power for the prevalence of its own policy. But what the political Nonconformists are accused of doing is confounding probabilities with certainties, denouncing those who take opposite views on the questions of method and charging them with not caring about the end, employing their Church organization for the suppression of all political opinions counter to their own among their fellow-religionists, stirring up fierce passions and using the most violent language in the process, with the consequent result of diverting into these channels the greater part of their vitality from the quiet and peaceful paths of the spiritual life. Such is the charge against the political clerics of whom Mr. Horne himself is perhaps the most aggravated specimen. It is a domestic controversy, and we must leave them to settle it for itself. As outsiders, all we can say is that such an identification of religion with politics is not edifying, and is not likely to work for the national welfare.

The other episode which we must not pass over quite unnoticed, concerns the part in the Conference taken by the Government. Quite in the manner of one who issues orders to his subordinates, the Rev. Thomas Law, the secretary to the Free Church Council, stated on the Wednesday morning that "he had told Mr. Runciman that they must, if possible, have a Cabinet Minister to represent him, and he and Mr. Asquith

felt the full force of the request." Mr. Runciman had intended to come himself, but was detained by the necessity of defending himself from attack in the debate the Opposition were about to raise over the Swansea school case. Mr. Trevelyan, however, his Under-Secretary, would come in his place. Accordingly Mr. Trevelyan came and spoke at the closing meeting, but with results which can hardly have been satisfactory to the Government. On Thursday evening, in the House of Commons, Mr. Runciman protested with some warmth against the accusation that "he had shown vindictiveness against the Church schools, and that he had decided in this [Swansea] case against the managers because it was a Church school," and "he assured the House that he had been actuated by no such motive," adding "that as long as he had to administer the Act of 1902 he would administer it justly and fairly." Moreover the Attorney-General, speaking in Mr. Runciman's support and defending the legal advice he had given him, was constrained under pressure of debate to admit that the Swansea authorities in cutting down the teachers' salaries had behaved in a manner which "unfortunately was not illegal" but still was "an ungenerous thing to do." Yet almost at the same hour Mr. Trevelyan was speaking at Swansea in terms such as these :

Ministers were being attacked because they would not stretch the law against the advice of their law advisers to make it fit the views of the Denominationalist managers and the Bishops. They intended to do nothing of the kind. When you are administering an unjust and unpopular law the only safe and possible plan to follow was to administer the letter of the law with strict impartiality. The Board of Education would give Denominationalists their pound of flesh, but they must be content with their bond. . . . The Government was helpless to satisfy the Free Churchmen. What they could do in administration they were doing and would do, but they could not alter the law.

The conflict between the words of the Under-Secretary and those of his official chief are glaring. What is the explanation? We do not believe that Mr. Runciman was insincere in his professions of impartiality in the House of Commons. We are quite sure he would wish to carry out the existing law in its own spirit of equal treatment for all. The conflict is clearly due to the unfortunate servitude to the Free Church clique in which the Government has placed itself. At Westminster Mr. Runciman could partially forget his chains. At Swansea Mr. Trevelyan was constrained to remember them.

S. F. S.



## *"My Catholic Socialist."*

A DIALOGUE.

---

"The Hill and Asperous Way that leadeth into the House of Sanity."

*Sir T. Browne.*

---

"WHAT we want," said the young man, "and what they want, and what the whole Church wants, is a programme," and he slammed the railway-carriage window to with emphasis. In Belgium, you cannot unfasten the door of a railway-carriage without first lowering the window, which explains what might otherwise be thought negligence on the part of the gentleman who had just left us. He had been very interesting, too, this gentleman. He had three votes, and regretted the progress that Socialism was making in the country.

"So you think a programme is the thing?" I answered as pleasantly as I could. All my life I have been singularly unfortunate in my travelling companions, and welcomed the more eagerly what promised to be an agreeable exception to the rule. The young man's friendliness was no doubt partly due to the fact that, in a very unsensational sense, we were strangers in a strange land, and found the use of our mother-tongue as soothing as a soft pillow after one of iron or marble.

"I am convinced of it," he replied, "thoroughly convinced. No one ever succeeded yet who had not a good programme. Look at the early Christians, look at St. Francis of Assisi, look at Martin Luther, look at the French Revolution! They all had programmes in big type, printed in red, with plenty of capital letters, and they all beat people whose programmes were printed small, with no good headlines."

I wondered if he might be, perhaps, an exceptionally refined American journalist. Though his vigorous generalization somewhat shocked my historical sense, I refrained from criticism, and suggested mildly that he had perhaps a programme of his own.



"I have indeed," he replied, "I am a Catholic Socialist."

He expected an exclamation of horror, but, though anxious to please, my conscience would not allow the fraud, and I received the intelligence with equanimity.

"Some people have a prejudice against Catholic Socialists," he said with rather the aggrieved air of one defrauded of his just rights. "Especially priests,"—and he glanced at my Roman collar to recall me to a sense of my duty. "They think the Pope has condemned Socialism," he added.

"I have met such persons," I replied. "There seemed, I thought, at first sight, some little foundation for their view."

"It's quite a mistake, though," he continued, "quite a mistake. Socialism, as I understand it, has been no more condemned than Political Economy. I would even go so far as to say that, in my sense of the word, Leo XIII. was himself a Socialist."

His anxiety to shock me was this time so obvious that I thought charity demanded a little emotion. So I raised my eyebrows and muttered, "Indeed, indeed!"

"The average Catholic is generally at least ten years behind the times," he continued, not yet thoroughly satisfied. "The other day I bought a book on Socialism by a Catholic. I bought it *because* it was by a Catholic. It cost six shillings net. Would you believe that it was mainly taken up with a singularly unsatisfactory attempt to refute the materialistic conception of history of Carl Marx?"

I murmured politely.

"Which we threw overboard at least five years ago," he added, and looked triumphantly out of the window at the flat Belgian landscape that was sliding past.

"What they don't seem able to understand," he continued, "is that Socialism is in a state of perpetual change. It is, as a German Socialist said the other day, a 'moulting doctrine.'"

"Bernstein, was it not?" I interposed, and was pleased to see this display of erudition had impressed him. "I remember," I continued, "thinking the image a singularly ungraceful one. It gave me a mental picture of a half-plucked fugitive hen."

He smiled indulgently. "It's not very good, perhaps, but it's true, isn't it?" The fact that I had read a speech of Herr Bernstein's had lessened the distance between us enormously.

"There can be no doubt whatever about it," I answered. "Between the Socialism, let us say, of St. Simon, and the

Socialism of Herr Werner, or of Bernstein, there is all the difference between insanity and reason."

He began to think that I was a singularly intelligent clergyman; and it is always pleasant to be thought intelligent.

"Why, of course there is," he said eagerly. "And it was the mad Socialism that the Pope condemned, wasn't it?"

"Well, was it now?" I answered. "If a gentleman comes to me and solemnly proposes that we shall try which of us can stand on his head the longest, I do not waste time in pointing out the logical and practical objections to the course proposed, but look anxiously round for his keeper. On the other hand, if a friend tells me he is about to invest his entire fortune in an undertaking I believe to be unsound, I do my best to dissuade him, and bring out all my argumentative artillery to shatter it. No, no, my dear sir, the hare-brained Socialism, believe me, was not worth condemning. It is the plausible Socialism that has caused all the pother."

My companion compressed his lips and looked dogged. I had become once again the unintelligent clerical adversary. "If it was reasonable, then," he asked, "why should it have been condemned?"

"Will you allow me to evade the question for a moment?" I replied, "and to ask you why you think it should not have been condemned?"

"Why it should not have been condemned?" he answered, leaning forward and speaking with great earnestness. "Simply because Justice and Humanity demand it. Because an economic machine that distributes so badly that it turns out paupers on one side and millionaires on the other wants knocking to pieces and remaking. That's all my Socialism aims at doing; it's a pure matter of economics,—the replacing of an old prehistoric rattle-trap abomination by a new scientific distributor that will work a little more evenly."

"And you think the present economic system altogether incapable of improvement?" I asked.

"Absolutely," he said, "*absolutely*. A system which obliges large masses of the population to live in perpetual danger of starvation, which automatically presses wages down to the famine point, which is built over a foul cesspool into which it thrusts all the poor and weak and suffering, seems to me to be damned on the very face of it."

"Humph!" I said reflectively, and was sorry to see that I had annoyed him.

"I have lived, I tell you, in an English city," he continued, "where only to walk through the streets in winter time was to feel my whole being cry out to Heaven against the iniquity, where I saw children in rags and bare-footed, crying for want of food, where for a third of the population this sort of thing is almost normal. And on the outskirts of this city, surrounded by a wall six miles long, is the castle of a man who died recently and left three million pounds. I say that an economic system that produces such contrasts is radically rotten and needs reforming. Simply that."

"I don't think any reasonable man doubts or denies it," I answered seriously, anxious to soothe him, for which of us has not had his heart pierced by this same cruel thing he had described? "It is only a question of what shape the reform should take. We were talking a moment ago of programmes. Is there not a Catholic programme of Reform; that of the Comte de Mun and his party, for example, or that of the Belgian Catholic Democrats?"

"Bah!" he answered, not in the least appeased. "What do the French Catholics want? Simply Trades' Unionism and a little protection. What do the Belgians talk about? Little petty measures like compulsory insurance, and perhaps in a gassy sort of way, the regulation of wages! It is the weakness of these Catholic programmes that makes me a Socialist. Society is like a man rolling on the ground in the agony of a terrible disease, and you come to him with a glass of milk and water and say, 'Here, poor man, take a sip of this,' and he glared at me as though I were actually performing the despicable act."

"And you," I said firmly, for I felt that the time for retaliation had arrived, "you, it seems to me, come in with a hatchet and say, 'Poor man, how you suffer, let me cut off both your legs.'"

I hoped he would at least smile, but he was too good and too much in earnest.

"That's pure nonsense," he said sternly. "Socialism is essentially constructive, and there is nothing constructive in cutting off a man's legs. It doesn't seem to me exactly a matter for joking."

"Certainly not," I replied; "let us both return to sobriety. If you will permit me to add a little brandy to my milk and water, I will transform your hatchet into a surgeon's operating knife."

This, as Mr. Kipling's subaltern says, was transpontine but necessary. It appealed to his love of illustration and he unbent a little.

"As much brandy as ever you like," he replied grimly, "and I don't mind accepting the operating knife. I don't think you will find that you have gained very much."

"Your admirable simile," I remarked, "reminds me of a story in one of the Arabian Chronicles of the Crusades, it is either in Bohadin or in Ibin Alator, I have forgotten for the moment which. As it is short, and I think we may find it useful to the matter in hand, I will, with your permission, relate it."

He assented readily enough, though with the air of an antagonist conceding a point.

"The story is about a certain Christian knight who had a bad foot," I continued. "As was common with the Christians who lived in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, he was on excellent terms with his Mohammedan neighbours, and called in a Mohammedan doctor to attend him. The Arabs, I need not remind you, had at that period practically a monopoly of medical science."

He assented a little impatiently, vexed no doubt at my readiness to impart unnecessary information.

"The Arab doctor," I continued, "prescribed for the case, he dieted his patient, scientifically poulticed the injured member, and thanks to his skilful treatment, it began to make satisfactory progress."

"One day the knight was visited by a friend lately arrived from Europe. This friend also happened to be a doctor, I am afraid I must confess that he was also a monk. He cried out in horror at the monstrosity of a Christian being tended by a Mohammedan doctor, declared the treatment utterly wrong, called for a block of wood and an axe, and promptly hacked off the foot of the unfortunate knight. The Arab physician arrived while this remarkable operation was in progress. The knight died a couple of days later from the effects of the shock. One sympathizes with the knight, a victim of unreflecting orthodoxy, but also a little, I think, with the Mohammedan physician."

"It's a parable, I suppose," said my companion. "I think, perhaps, it would be better if you explained it. I fancy I might easily go wrong."

"With pleasure," I replied. "The Mohammedan doctor, I need hardly say, represents the Pope."

"That seems a little incongruous," he objected.

"Not in the very least," I hastened to explain, surprised at his slowness of apprehension. "We will take the proposition member by member. Is it not, in the first place, sufficiently clear that the relation of the Popes to what we used to call Christendom and now call Western Civilization, is very much that of a physician to his patient? The Pope is in the position of the family doctor who has watched the patient through the maladies of infancy and childhood, and for that reason knows her temperament better and can prescribe more scientifically than is possible for a strange practitioner. In his big, rambling old house in Rome he has a collection of professional notes and memoranda such as no one else possesses. When Europa at fifty is stricken with scarlet fever, his diagnosis, and his alone, is modified by observations taken when she had the whooping-cough at fifteen."

"That sounds very ingenious," he said, "but why a Mohammedan doctor?"

"The second member," I replied genially. "I am coming to that. The Pope, you see, is not the only doctor in the field, there is a school of rival practitioners. The parallel holds good, for they are at once fanatically opposed to him on religious grounds, and immeasurably his inferiors in their scientific attainments."

"Ha!" he interrupted. "Would you say that now, I wonder, if Mr. Bernard Shaw were here?"

"Probably not," I replied. "I am a man of peace. But the fact remains true, none the less, and the proof of it lies in this, that all the best sociologists are in substantial agreement with the Pope."

He stared incredulously.

"I take the two greatest of the last century, Comte and Taine. Comte did not know much history, it is true, but he was a genius, and his conclusions are often of value. Taine was also a genius, and knew a great deal of history. His *Origines de la France Contemporaine* is perhaps the most masterly sociological treatise we possess. From beginning to end it is a crushing demonstration of the impossibility of modern Socialism. Many Socialists are admirable, and even profound, economists, but very few, it seems to me, are even decent sociologists."

"I don't admit that," he said rather angrily. "Schäffle, for example. Isn't he a good sociologist, and isn't he a Socialist too?"

"No," I replied placidly, for he had given a bad example. "Schäffle, in the work we all know, made some concessions to Socialism, but he afterwards withdrew them. He has since published a book on the impracticability of Socialism.<sup>1</sup> But he is certainly a very great sociologist. I will willingly add him to my list of practitioners who agree with the Pope."

"I have read," I continued, "a certain number of books on Socialism. Now, the French Revolution seems to be a fact sufficiently pertinent to the matter in hand to merit careful study. I have looked in vain in them for any more profound reflection upon it than that it was the work of the bourgeoisie exploiting the proletariat. That seems to me, compared with Taine's masterly analysis, fairly crude sociology."

My companion looked unhappy. I perceived that he was one of those unfortunate logicians whom a new view of a subject distresses profoundly if it will not at once fit into their neat case of syllogistic pigeon-holes. He welcomed the arrival of the ticket-collector at this moment as a timely interruption.

The collector extracted yet another morsel from our already attenuated tickets, and told us we should be in Liège in less than twenty minutes. When he had left us I suggested that we should continue the discussion, though my conscience told me it was rapidly degenerating into a monologue. My opponent consented, though rather with the air of one about passively to resist.

"To return, then, to our parable," I said, "the Pope, the wise old physician, is called in to prescribe for Europa, and alas! he is now for her something of a Mohammedan physician, for Europa has lost her early faith. He would, if she would let him, bind up her poor wounded old feet, and give her soothing medicines, and tell her plainly that she will never really be well until she begins to say her prayers again and to honour her father and mother as she did when she was a little girl. But he has scarcely commenced his work of charity and science before the rival doctors appear."

"And the rival doctors, I believe, propose to cut off both her legs," he interposed with a slight sneer. "I cannot say that the comparison seems to me very happy, or even very polite."

<sup>1</sup> *Die Aussichtslosigkeit des Sozialismus.*

"One moment, one moment," I replied good-naturedly (who would not be good-natured with such a charming allegory to develop?). "It is very difficult to make out exactly what the new doctors want to do. Apparently most of them want to perform an operation of some sort, though even that is not perfectly clear. They have got hold of a new idea, a big idea, one which excites and interests them immensely. They are all talking about it at once, and saying what wonderful things it will do for Europa if she will only let them apply it. But when an attempt is made to discover the precise nature of this panacea, as I say, they seem to give contradictory answers. Some, and perhaps the most enlightened," I bowed, "say that it is practically identical with the Pope's own remedy; others appear to regard it as a severe operation in which certain of Europa's members, hitherto regarded as legitimate portions of her anatomy, are to be treated as excrescences, and ruthlessly lopped off. In the hands of others it becomes a sort of miraculous medicine, pleasant to take, and curing all evils, including the patient's well-known moral defects of inherent selfishness and bad temper. Others, again, are certain that it is essentially a course of gymnastics, and these are the Fabians and believers in education. Most surprising of all, some appear to hold that Europa has in reality already taken the medicine without knowing it, though in that case why she should still be so sore and grumpy remains to be explained. Your champion, the terrible Mr. Shaw, appears to be one of this latter class."

"Indeed," he interjected, "where does he say that now?"

"No doubt in many places, for he refers to it in a letter in the *Times* a few days ago<sup>1</sup> as a first principle. All decent men are nine-tenths Socialists, he holds, whether they know it or not, because the only alternative to being a Socialist is to be a thief. I thought it a very interesting attempt to create a new dichotomy."

"I don't agree with everything Mr. Shaw says," replied the young man. "I don't suppose anybody does."

"Probably not," I replied. "Isolation is one of the penalties of genius. But let me continue my parable. We have now gathered round the sick-bed of Europa the old doctor who has known her from childhood, with his old note-books and his mediæval and pre-mediæval memory, and the young doctors

<sup>1</sup> The *Times*, February 3, 1909.



who only know her as she is now, whose memory is limited by the Revolution. It is, I think, no disparagement to them to say that, in face of the Pope they appear very young, mere students, even schoolboys. And they are very excited, and making a terrible noise in the sick-room, which is a capital crime, and they cannot agree on so elementary a question as to whether Europa's stomach is really part of her or only a kind of long-standing tumour."

"Now you're beginning to exaggerate again," said my young man. He had quite regained his good temper.

"Not a bit of it," I answered defiantly. "I will go even further. They cannot agree upon even more fundamental questions. They doubt whether the air she breathes is really necessary for her. Some of them hold that her present shape as an organism with parts is a mistake, and that she ought to be immersed in a powerful dissolvent, and reduced to her primitive atoms. They have even, in some unfortunate countries, commenced the dissolvent process, though the old Doctor tells them they are killing the patient, and the wiser men in those lands know that he speaks the truth. The attempt in France to destroy the family and to build the State upon the individual made a Catholic of the sociologist, Le Play, a generation ago, and in our own days has brought back to the Church such men as Brunetière, Bourget, and most interesting of all, Maurice Barrès."

"I don't think I quite follow you," said my companion, impressed by my sudden descent to solid fact. "Do you mean that a people does not consist of individuals?"

"Emphatically it does not," I replied. "A people evolved under the influence of Christianity, consists of families and classes as certainly as a living body is made up of cells and organs. And if you attempt to prescribe for such a people without fully recognizing this primitive fact, you will certainly kill it. You might as reasonably treat a man's body as though it were composed of malleable clay, and try to roll it into the shape of a cylinder. Instead of finding your love of symmetry gratified by the appearance of a trim round cylinder, you will have a mangled and unsightly mass of flesh and bone for your pains."

It was another new view, and he was again distressed. "You see, my dear sir," I continued, "how essentially insane the situation is,—a number of doctors in face of a serious case



discussing with much heat a question of first principles. A mild degree of insanity is in some walks of life comparatively harmless, it may even be a distinct advantage, but I think we are at one in holding that whether for the body politic or for the individual, we must at least have sanity in our doctors."

He did not answer, but looked gloomily at the map of Belgium on the partition in front of him.

"The Pope, almost alone," I continued, "recognizes this fact, and strives to recall the world to its importance. As I say, amid the multitude of voices it is difficult to determine with any precision the exact nature of the new remedy. It seems to contain elements which are praiseworthy, and indeed essentially Christian; on the other hand, there can be no doubt that in the hands of certain of its exponents it becomes a most deadly poison. With a view to averting calamity, and perhaps also with a view to extracting the gold from the dross, certainly with a view to recalling the world to the importance of sanity in politics—the Pope in round terms condemns the whole thing. Let us remember that the condemnation was not the work of an ordinary Pope, if I may use the expression without irreverence. It was the deliberate act of a Pope who was in the natural order a very great man, and a very great sociologist. Of all the wise acts of Leo XIII., this trumpet-call to sanity seems to me the very greatest and wisest."

"You seem to think it very hard to be sane," said my companion, not at all moved by my enthusiasm.

"When," I replied, "one feels deeply on a matter (as in the present instance who does not?), there is, believe me, nothing harder. I, too, my dear sir, like yourself, have lived in an English city, and seen the cruel and shameful things you described to me just now, and like yourself have felt my heart grow hot with indignation and an indescribable desire to throw stones at rich men. In such moments I recall the words of an old writer of whom I am very fond, who had a remarkably steady head (he was a doctor, by the way), and who speaks in one of his works of 'The hill and asperous way that leadeth into the House of Sanity.' With a groan I turn from the pleasing spectacle of the discomfited millionaire and the shattered windows of his palace and set myself again to climb that hill. It is not very exciting, sometimes not even very interesting, but so far as it goes it is solid, and it is certainly sane."

"Yes," said my companion, "but does it lead anywhere? Do you ever hope to get to the top? Have you any hope at all, beyond making half a dozen people a little more comfortable?"

"Yes," I replied, "I have some hope; one can hardly live without it. I have watched, sometimes, a wilful child run away from his mother, and try to do things that were too difficult and dangerous for it. I am thinking in particular of a little boy I once saw trying to carry a big basket of apples. The basket was too heavy for him; he could not lift it, and could hardly drag it along. After a long and valiant struggle, like a wise little man, he put his pride in his pocket and called to his mother to help him, and with her help the task became quite easy. In my more optimistic moments I hope that some such thing may happen in this matter of Socialism, that the task, dangerous and impossible without religion, may be accomplished by its aid."

"I like that idea," said my friend, for the first time cordially agreeing.

"I sometimes fancy," I continued, encouraged by his sympathy, "that in the creation of a sound Catholic sociology we may find the instrument by which this conversion is to be attained, a new Positivism such as Brunetière conceived,<sup>1</sup> and might, perhaps, had he been spared, have himself produced. I even fancy I see the beginning of such a system in the sociological writings of the French Traditionalists."

"I must read them," he said, almost with enthusiasm.

"But though I hope," I continued, with the pleasant feeling that I had my audience with me, "though I hope, I confess that I fear still more. I fear a struggle in which a portion of the labouring class (and, mind you, it will only be a portion, and that the less intelligent), led by doctrinaires, demagogues, high-minded but impractical enthusiasts, with a sprinkling of fanatics, and fettered at every step by the entanglements of a preposterous ethical system, will engage in a struggle with Capitalism and the Church, and all the forces of tradition, and the still more formidable forces of human selfishness. Capitalism alone might fall an easy prey, and I for one should not weep over its grave; but Capitalism with these allies, it seems to me, is bound to be victorious."

<sup>1</sup> Ferdinand Brunetière, *Sur Les Chemins de la Croissance, L'Utilization du Positivism. Discours de Combat* (seconde série). *Les Motifs d'Espoir*.

"It's simply maddening," said my companion.

"It would be disaster," I replied, "a terrible disaster; and the responsibility of the leaders who have led their forces to the unequal combat will also be terrible. Ah, my dear sir, let us sympathize with the terrible suffering we are bound to look upon, but let us not, in sympathizing, cease to be sane."

Our train, while this remarkable peroration was in progress, had been picking its way cautiously down the great hill that leads into Liège (the very hill down which Duke Charles of Burgundy dragged the apologetic King of France to see his friends beheaded in the city), and at its close accomplished the most sane of all proceedings by arriving at its destination. We shook hands almost affectionately, and my companion was good enough to say that he had enjoyed the conversation.

"I too have enjoyed it," I replied, "and must thank you for your patience. If you are staying in Liège, let me beg of you not to neglect to visit the Citadel. The climb is stiff, especially if you go by the stairway on the Mont de Beuron, but there is always a fresh breeze at the top, and the view is really magnificent."

R. P. GARROLD.

## *Man and Monkey.*

UNDOUBTEDLY the net result of evolutionary teaching as it is apprehended by what we usually describe as "the man in the street" was adequately represented by a conversation overheard in our Natural History Museum on a recent bank holiday. A poor working woman with a small girl found herself confronted by the fine statue of Darwin in the entrance-hall. "Poor old Darwin," said the mother. "Look, Polly, here's the man who said we came from monkeys."

"Evolution," for the vast majority of those who know the term, means simply the doctrine that the human race has grown out of gorillas or orangs, and Darwin is remembered as the discoverer and teacher of this great truth. Neither of these ideas is justified on scientific grounds. It is not pretended by any anthropologist that mankind are lineally descended from any simian form of which we have positive knowledge, either living or fossil, and although Darwin undoubtedly countenanced the theory of our bestial origin, it cannot be pretended that his *Descent of Man* is either the most important of his own works or the most effective piece of ordnance brought against the position of his adversaries.

There can be no question that the foremost champion of the ultra-evolutionists is at present, and has been for several years, Professor Ernst Haeckel, of Jena, whose works are assiduously propagated and popularized by such bodies as the Rationalist Press Association, whose scientific authority is proclaimed as paramount, and of course blindly accepted as such by vast multitudes who are unable to form any judgment of their own upon such a question. Such being the case, it is advisable, and even necessary, to examine what is the truth of the matter in this regard.

But, to begin with, it should be clearly understood that it is not science, but the deceptive pretence of science, which is

responsible for most of the ideas popularly entertained upon this subject. As in the instances already quoted, it is obvious that the mass of men have an inexhaustible capacity for swallowing assertions, however groundless, if only they are sensational and graphic. A striking headline in an evening newspaper announcing that the origin of life has been revealed, is far more efficacious in this direction than any demonstration to the contrary by the most eminent men of science, such as Pasteur or Huxley, and in like manner the "restoration" of a lately discovered fossil at Chapelle-aux-Saints, in the department of Corrèze, in France, as reproduced by one of our weekly illustrated journals from the *Illustration*, of Paris, is doubtless held by many persons, who think themselves scientific, to afford proof positive that here we have irrefragable evidence that man is simply a developed ape, and that at last we have discovered the famous "missing link."

As this particular example, now actually before the public eye, serves well to illustrate our whole subject, a few words must be said about it in particular before we proceed further.

That the skeleton discovered by two French priests, and by them submitted to the first scientific authorities, is a very remarkable one, the importance of which can scarcely be exaggerated, must be fully allowed. It evidently belonged to a man of very low type, exhibiting many features which we commonly describe as "bestial," and so far approximates our bodily frame to that of the brutes. At the same time, it is *not* the missing link, and does nothing to bridge the gulf between Man and Beast which had not already been done by the well-known relics discovered at Neanderthal, Spy, and elsewhere, belonging to a race which is recognized as once widely extended, during what is known as the "Mousterian Epoch," over great part of Western Europe. The skeleton is distinctly human, and its possessor was clearly marked off from all apes. He knew the use of tools, and could make them, as is witnessed by workings in flint found along with his remains. He had some sort of religious ideas, for he had been buried by his fellows in a tomb prepared for the purpose, there being a striking difference between the treatment of his remains and those of animals found in the same cave, which were carelessly cast about. Though his forehead is receding, his cranial capacity, 1,000 cubic centimetres, is equal to that of many men at the present day, even, it is said, to that of the late M. Gambetta,

and is twice as great as that of any ape.<sup>1</sup> How much reliance may be placed upon "restorations" such as we have spoken of, may be judged from the fact that whereas the skeleton was discovered in fragments, not even the cranium, which was most fully represented, being complete, while hands and feet were alike wanting, the artist, though claiming to found his reproduction upon scientific evidence alone, has supplied these out of his own head, and whatever else was needed to make his picture exactly what he thinks it ought to be, including a shaggy vesture of hair, of which of course there is no vestige.

Nor can it be said that in this respect the popular illustrator is discountenanced by his scientific chiefs, and in particular by Professor Haeckel himself. That the latter is an eminent man of science no one will deny, and so long as he speaks of matters upon which his knowledge is really scientific, he must be listened to with respect. But unfortunately when he mounts the evolutionary hobby-horse, in particular when he approaches his favourite doctrine of the essential bestiality of man, he casts to the winds all principles not merely of science, but of commonsense, and even common honesty, and sets before a credulous public what his own scientific colleagues, pronouncing his anthropology to be that of a mere fanatic,<sup>2</sup> repudiate as dishonourable to the cause of science.

It is more than forty years since Haeckel exhibited his ideas as to how science may be abused to serve his purposes, in the notorious instance of the "three wood-cuts," which should, it might be supposed, have for ever destroyed his authority in the eyes of the world, scientific or otherwise. In his "Natural History of Creation" (*Natürlichen Schöpfungsgeschichte*), published in 1868, to support his statement that in their rudimentary stages wholly different animals exactly resemble one another, and thus testify that they are all developments from one identical form, he printed in one place<sup>3</sup> plates which purported to be the embryos of a man, an ape, and a dog, pointing out that they were exactly alike, and elsewhere<sup>4</sup> three other plates, to represent those of a dog, a fowl, and a turtle, similarly indistinguishable. Presently, however, it was observed, by

<sup>1</sup> Fuller particulars are given in the *Revue pratique d'Apologétique*, January 15, 1909, pp. 611, seq.

<sup>2</sup> See article by Father E. Wasmann, S.J., "Alte und neue Forschungen Haeckels über der Menschenproblem," in the *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, February 8, 1909, pp. 169, seq. Of this article much use will be made in what follows.

<sup>3</sup> P. 242.

<sup>4</sup> P. 248.

Professor Rüttimeyer, of Basle, that no wonder the objects represented were precisely similar, as in both instances the same plate had been printed three times over, with only the title altered, as was proved by accidental scratches and fissures on the face of the blocks.<sup>1</sup>

What is still more remarkable, Professor Haeckel did not attempt to deny the charge thus brought against him. But, although he described it "as a very foolish blunder" (*eine höchst unbesonnene Torheit*), he was by no means inclined to plead guilty to dishonesty, or a wish to deceive, defending himself on the extraordinary plea, that inasmuch as these various embryos *are* in fact exactly similar, there can be no dishonesty in so exhibiting them. As he triumphantly put it to his adversaries—"Were you to compare the rudimentary embryos themselves, you would be unable to find any distinction between them."

It is clear that even were the fact in accordance with such a statement, there could be no excuse for such a piece of trickery. But *are* the facts as thus represented? We have such evidence to the contrary as that of Professor Lieberkühn, of Marburg, who in a public lecture to his pupils thus delivered himself:<sup>2</sup>

Professor Haeckel of Jena maintains in his popular writings, that the embryos of men and beasts cannot in their earlier stages be distinguished. Gentlemen, I can quite believe that Professor Haeckel is unable to distinguish these embryos. It does not, however, follow that others cannot do so. Mix together in a bowl all sorts of embryos, and I will tell you the origin of each.

The case of the three woodcuts, though it has attained more notoriety than some others, is by no means singular. On the contrary, such scientific authorities as His, Semper, Hensen, Bischoff, Hamann, and others, declare that of Haeckel's plates, some are pure "inventions," and others are arbitrarily altered to suit his purpose, and that, having thus wantonly trifled with facts, he has forfeited all claim to rank amongst serious men of science. The pre-eminent position which some would assign to him only shows how short now-a-days is memory.

Quite recently, however, the whole question has been again

<sup>1</sup> Wasmann, *ul. sup.*, p. 171. Also Dennert, *Die Wahrheit über Ernst Haeckel und seine "Welträtsel,"* 1904, p. 17. Those who choose to examine the original edition of Haeckel's work, of which there is a copy in the British Museum, will easily satisfy themselves of the truth in this regard.

<sup>2</sup> Dennert, p. 33.



re-opened by Dr. Arnold Brass, who has roundly denounced the falsifications of which Haeckel has thus been guilty. The attack has roused the Jena professor to attempt something more in the way of self-vindication than mere abuse of his assailants, whose accusations he has usually been content to dismiss as "downright lies" and "Christian slanders." He has accordingly published<sup>1</sup> a plea in his own defence; and a very wonderful plea it is. In order to put an end to what he describes as this "brutal fuss," he freely confesses that a small portion of his embryo illustrations, perhaps six or eight per cent., have been "faked"—but then, he urges, this has been done only with those pictures "in regard of which the available data are so incomplete or insufficient that, in order to construct an evolutionary series, one is compelled to fill in the *lacunae* with hypotheses and to reconstruct the missing links by comparative synthesis."

He declares, moreover, that in this respect he does not stand alone, but that a large number—he says "hundreds"—of the most trusted and esteemed biologists are in exactly the same case, and "doctor" their illustrations to make them tally with evolutionary exigencies. It is to be hoped that in such an assertion he does his scientific colleagues an unpardonable injustice, but certainly in any case nothing harder has ever been said of Evolution itself and its requirements, than this open declaration of its foremost apostle that it needs to be supported by such means.

Still more likely to mislead non-scientific readers as making more pretence to be based upon purely scientific data are the genealogical trees by means of which Professor Haeckel undertakes to exhibit the pedigree of the human race, and which, although he boldly declares them to be matter of historical fact, have no more right to such a character than the wood-cuts themselves of which we have spoken. As has already been said, no existing species of ape or monkey, neither Gorilla, Orang, Chimpanzee nor Gibbon can be claimed by Haeckel or anyone else as the direct ancestor of man. They are all set down as collateral descendants of an as yet undiscovered "common ancestor" from whom they and we alike have sprung. There must, however, have been a number of intermediate forms between the said ancestor and ourselves, as likewise between him and the collaterals. Unfortu-

<sup>1</sup> In the *Volkszeitung* of Berlin, 1908, No. 608.

nately, however there is no more trace to be found in the rocks of these intermediate links than of the great progenitor himself, and in order to bridge the gulf and complete his pedigree, Haeckel is forced to introduce a number of supposed creatures of whose existence there is no proof, except that his theory requires them, and no better warrant than the imposing Greek and Latin names which he bestows upon them: names which when analyzed are found merely to indicate that the objects to which they are affixed fill the place which they are wanted to fill. Thus, for instance, we have *Archiprimas* (the first of "Primates"<sup>1</sup>), *Archipithecus* (original ape), *Prothylobates* (original gibbon), *Pithecanthropus alalus* (speechless ape-man), and *Homo stupidus*, the latter being the immediate ancestor provided for *Homo sapiens*, the specific title assigned by Linnæus to man as he actually exists.

It is very remarkable that in the most recent and therefore authoritative form of this pedigree, (which has had frequently to be modified), there appears no form which is claimed to have been actually discovered. At earlier periods it was not so, and in particular two creatures whose remains had been found were loudly acclaimed as the long sought missing link between man and brute.

First came *Pithecanthropus erectus*, founded on the discovery in Java (1891), of a tooth, part of a skull, and a thigh bone, all lying somewhat apart, jubilantly declared by Haeckel himself to be the veritable missing link. Further observation has not borne out this judgment. It is by no means certain that all these relics belonged to the same owner. What is more to the point, the best anatomists—on the authority of Sir A. Geikie—are agreed that the skull at least is truly human, though of a low type.<sup>2</sup> Hence *Pithecanthropus erectus* does not figure in Haeckel's genealogical tree of 1898 and 1905, nor, it may be added, in those of his most ardent disciples.<sup>3</sup>

Another supposed link was *Homo primigenius*, based by Professor Schwalbe on the Neanderthal skull, and introduced by him to the notice of the scientific world in 1903. But this,

<sup>1</sup> According to Linnæan classification, the leading order of mammals including men, monkeys, lemurs, bats, and originally sloths as well, were thus named, as holding the first rank, a certain general resemblance in the structure of their skeletons being the bond of union between them.

<sup>2</sup> *Text-book of Geology* ii, 1347.

<sup>3</sup> See, for instance, Mr. Dennis Hird's *Picture-Book of Evolution*.

too, has failed to keep its place. The skull does not differ as much from that of an Australian, as do both from that of a Lapp, Lapps and Australians alike being nevertheless indubitable men. It has been declared upon high authority, that of Virchow, that men are to be found in the Low Countries, at the present day with Neanderthal skulls on their shoulders. Others have attributed it to very various sources, while some have gravely questioned its antiquity. Altogether it seems agreed that at least it is *not* the missing link, nor does it find a place in Professor Haeckel's genealogy.

Yet, in spite of all, Professor Haeckel continues to assure the world that the genealogy of which he can give no better evidence than this, is "an historically established fact."

He goes much further still, and actually cites these creations of his own fancy as scientific evidence to show what has been the course of nature. Thus he declares that the shape of their skulls "must convince us that the 'Primates' have progressed in an unbroken chain of evolutionary developments from their earliest common ancestor (the *Archiprimas*) to the ape-man (*Pithecanthropus*) and so to man himself," and in confirmation he appeals to his genealogical table. The reader would naturally imagine that all these various creatures—*Archiprimas*, *Archipithecus*, *Prothylobates*, *Pithecanthropus alalus*, have left us their skulls to be compared with one another—whereas, so far as any one knows, they had not a skull amongst them.

It is clear that here we have an outrage against common honesty—to say nothing of science, more flagrant even than the falsification of woodcuts.

One example more, out of many that might be brought, will sufficiently illustrate the utterly unscrupulous methods which Professor Haeckel freely employs in the propagation of his doctrines, and the amount of reliance which is due even to his most positive assertions.

In 1907 was celebrated the bicentenary of the birth of the great Linnæus, to whom, especially in the matter of classification, zoology and botany owe so much. On this occasion many eminent men of science received honorary degrees from Linnæus' own University of Upsala; amongst others Professor Haeckel. This occasion he seized, to make it appear to those who knew no better, that his doctrine of man's bestial origin was shared by Linnæus himself, which to anyone acquainted with the facts—with the reverent and religious character of the great Swede,

must appear too monstrous an absurdity to be entertained by any one. But Linnæus had in his classification of the animal kingdom included man, *Homo sapiens*, and placed this species, along with apes, lemurs, and bats in the order "Primates," or, as we may say, "front-rankers." Moreover, speaking of man in particular, Linnæus quotes the old philosopher's maxim, "Man, know thyself." Just so, explains Haeckel, "Know thyself, as only an animal which has risen from the ranks, and now stands in the front. By placing *Homo sapiens* at the head of the 'Primates,' Linnæus clearly teaches us that he is no more than the final development of the whole series which they concluded."

But this is what Linnæus did not and could not mean. He had no conception of Evolution, in fact he was the chief upholder of the fixity of species, each of which he held to have been separately created. In classing various creatures together, he had regard, as has been said, to their structure only, with no idea that they were genetically related. Certainly, neither he nor any other man ever supposed that men had any family connection with bats. And man, he expressly and emphatically declared, stands altogether apart from the rest of creation and occupies a place entirely his own.

*Homo sapiens* [he writes] of all created works the most perfect, the highest and the last, set upon the surface of this earth, which is covered with wondrous monuments of the divine majesty, who by means of his faculties can judge of the workmanship, admire its beauty, and reverence its Author.

It is not wonderful therefore that a distinguished botanist, Hofrath Julius Wiesner, has stigmatized the work which Haeckel professed to devote to the honour of Linnæus, as nothing but a libel, exhibiting its author as hoodwinking the public by setting forth long exploded errors as incontrovertible truths, and assailing his adversaries with outrageous rudeness.

This last feature of Haeckel's mode of argument might well tempt us to examine some specimens, which would make it more difficult than ever to understand the high position so widely assigned to him. For nothing, it would seem, could be more thoroughly unscientific than the grossness of the abuse with which he freely bespatters all who differ from him, in a style that we should describe as Billingsgate. Where is the humour, even the blasphemous humour, of describing the Almighty as a "gaseous vertebrate"? Indeed, what possible sense is there

in such a description? Yet Haeckel and his followers appear to be proud of it. Of Christ, the Professor speaks in terms which we will not repeat. Of His Mother he tells a scandalous story, for which he has since been forced to confess that he had no better authority than the scurrilous pamphlet of an obscure English freethinker, while, as for those who venture to contradict his so-called scientific doctrines, "liars" "fools" or "ignoramuses" are the mildest terms he is wont to apply.

It is not wonderful that Dr. Paulsen of Berlin should have declared that he has read Haeckel's *Riddle* "with burning shame," to think that such a book should have obtained such credit amongst his countrymen. Yet it is this very book that is assiduously puffed amongst ourselves, as conveying the final verdict of science regarding the question with which it deals, and as proving beyond doubt that we all came from monkeys, as the poor woman with whose utterance we began supposed Darwin to have done.

J. G.

## *The Royal Commission on the Poor Laws.*

---

A CATHOLIC VIEW.

---

THE English Poor Law, as all are aware, began in the attempt to cope with the terrible disasters which followed the abolition of the Monasteries by Henry VIII. The poor were with us then, as they always will be, but the monks knew from experience how to deal with them, whereas the legislators from that day to this have been compelled to learn this Christian art by experimental Acts of Parliament. Many hundreds of these Acts have been passed by our statesmen, from the curious Act of Edward VI. in 1551, (which enacted that everyone should give an alms to the collectors on Sundays, and that if any refused, the Bishop should admonish him) to the Poor Law Act of 1899, which deals *inter alia*, with the adoption of children. This first Act of Edward VI. was soon doomed to failure, as the innovations in doctrine favoured rapine rather than benevolence, and further measures followed in rather rapid succession, the majority of which proved unworkable. At one time it would be all indoor relief, and at another, only outdoor relief. Even after this lapse of time it is impossible to get together any number of Poor Law experts without causing trouble the moment these two subjects are opened for discussion. Gilbert's Act in 1782, which extended the policy of uniting parishes into Unions, forbade the Guardians to send to the workhouses any but the "impotent": and an Act of 1796 expressly enacted that anyone, able-bodied or not, might have relief at home if the justices thought it expedient. From that time onward the "rate in aid of wages" was a confessed policy, and the cost advanced by long strides till in 1817 it reached £7,870,800.

Another complaint following these Acts was that the pauper was on the whole in a much better condition than the independent labourer, and this, together with the frightful state

of immorality in England, especially in the rural districts, led to the appointment of the Poor Law Commission in 1832, who issued their report in February, 1834. This report has been considered the most remarkable and startling document to be found in the whole range of English social history. It opens with these words :

It is now our painful duty to report that the fund, which the 43rd of Elizabeth directed to be employed in setting to work children and persons capable of labour, but using no daily trade, and in the necessary relief of the impotent, is applied to purposes opposed to the letter, and still more to the spirit, of that law, and destructive to the morals of that most numerous class, and to the welfare of all.

The evidence produced in this report of the widespread abuse of the unprotected and homeless is so dreadful that no words of mine can accurately describe it, but it will be extremely necessary in dealing with the present Report, to watch most carefully that the recommendations of the Commissioners, especially those of the minority, if put into effect, do not lead to the same disastrous results, having particular regard to their efforts to find some permanent cure for unemployment.

It is not my intention in this article to go into any of the details of the report of 1834, but the Acts of Parliament passed since that date have been, generally speaking, so carefully drawn up, with all the defects of the old laws before the framers, that any drastic legislation at the present time is sure to lead to wholesale confusion and trouble. We are not, of course, defending all modern legislation in this matter. Catholics have always advocated a reform of the present Poor Laws. The late Mr. B. F. C. Costelloe read an excellent paper on the subject at the Catholic Conference in 1891. He had various theories to propose, some of which have been tried since without any great success, but his main point was to spread Catholic charitable organization wherever possible, and not to trust wholly to the law, because in dealing with the poor, law without charity could never succeed. Various papers from time to time have been read at the Annual Conferences of Catholic Guardians, dealing with one reform or another which seemed highly necessary. For instance, an important paper read at the 1904 Conference on "The Need of a Great Poor Law Reform" gave some very startling figures as to the cost of our present system. One example quoted showed that each inmate of a modern



institution occupied £400 worth of dwelling-space, and that the cost of maintaining him was £120 per annum ! Although I could go on with innumerable instances in which reform is required, no one of them by itself would indicate the necessity of completely destroying the present system and of building up another. It was necessary, therefore, for public reasons to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the present system as a whole, although there is nothing in the voluminous Report issued by the Commissioners which was not already known to many students of Poor Law and to the Local Government Board. The Commission has been sitting for three years, has held over 200 meetings, has taken evidence from over 1,300 witnesses, and the Commissioners have made more than 800 personal visits to Unions, meetings of Boards of Guardians, and institutions in England, Scotland, and Ireland. The evidence alone is expected to fill 14,000 folio pages.

The volume containing the Report consists of 1,250 folio pages, 640 of which are signed by a majority of fourteen out of eighteen, and over 500 by a minority of four. Some of the Commissioners who have signed the majority report have signed certain reservations to which I shall refer later. The recommendations occupy twenty-four pages of print, and number 250 ; it is obvious, therefore, that it will not be possible to deal with all or even a fair proportion of them in this article. I shall, however, attempt a summary review of the Report as a whole, and touch upon some of the main features of it. I may mention in the first place that, exhaustive as the Report seems to be, there are many important items in connection with the Poor Law which have not even received the consideration of the Commissioners. One example will suffice. A child entering a Metropolitan workhouse with its parent or parents is at once sent, if a Catholic, to a Catholic certified school without the consent of the parents, which is morally right but legally wrong: in the provinces a parent is asked first, and frequently objects ; consequently the child remains in the workhouse. This is morally wrong but legally right. The law in this case obviously needs to be brought into accord with morality. However, the Commissioners have given all earnest men and women sufficient material to occupy their careful attention for a long time to come.

Their recommendations come to this : Boards of Guardians are to be swept away, and in their place new local authorities,

which the Commission names "The System of Public Assistance," are to be appointed. The areas are to be enlarged from the present union of parishes to the County or County Borough.

The Public Assistance authority will be a statutory committee of the County or County Borough Council, constituted as follows:

(i.) One-half of the members to be appointed by the Council of the County or County Borough, and the persons so appointed may be persons who are members of the Council.

(ii.) The other half of the members to be appointed by the Council from outside their number, and to consist of persons experienced in the local administration of Public Assistance or other cognate work.

(iii.) The actual number of members of the Public Assistance authority, in each case and from time to time, to be determined by the Local Government Board, after consideration of a scheme submitted on the first occasion by the Council of the County or County Borough, and on subsequent occasions by the Public Assistance authority.

(iv.) Women to be eligible for appointment under either head (i.) or (ii.).

Each Public Assistance authority will nominate local committees, to be called Public Assistance Committees, which will work in the existing union areas; these committees will include:

A certain proportion of persons nominated by the Urban and Rural District Councils, and, where a Voluntary Aid Committee has been established, a certain proportion nominated by that committee. The persons so nominated shall be experienced in the local administration of Public Assistance or other cognate work, and shall include a proportion of women, in our judgment not ordinarily less than one-third. One-third of the members shall retire each year, but shall be eligible for reappointment.

The above scheme would be applied to London with the following modifications:

(a) The area for the new Public Assistance authority would be that of the London County Council. The areas of the Public Assistance Committees would generally be the areas of the existing Unions, though in certain cases some readjustment would be necessary.

(b) The Public Assistance authority for London would be a statutory committee of the London County Council, with statutory duties.

(c) One-half of the members of the statutory committee to be nominated by the London County Council, either from their own number or from outside.

(*d*) One-quarter of the members of the statutory committee to be appointed by the London County Council from outside their own number, and to consist of persons of skill and experience in the administration of public assistance or other cognate work.

(*e*) One-quarter of the members of the statutory committee to be nominated by the Local Government Board so as to secure representation on the committee of such interests as the medical and legal professions, employers and working-men, hospital administration, charitable organizations, &c.

(*f*) The London Public Assistance Committees will be constituted as in the county, except that nominees of the Metropolitan Borough Councils will be substituted for nominees of Urban and Rural District Councils.

It is also proposed that Poor Law expenditure in London be a uniform charge over the whole area according to rateable value.

Before proceeding to the reasons for the enlargement of areas, it would be well to consider how the scheme proposed will work out. Although only a small percentage of electors go to the poll for Guardians' elections, those who do trouble to go are very jealous of their rights, and strongly resent any attempt to take them away. We already hear strong complaints about the Metropolitan Asylums Board, who are annually spending vast sums of money upon the poor, although only a nominated body. The majority of its members are nominated by Boards of Guardians, and a few by the Local Government Board. The Commissioners, however, have made out a fairly good case and it *may* be allowed to become law, but assuming it does, will the London County Council be able to discharge efficiently another burden, added to its already overwhelming labours? This body, excellent as it is, has an enormous difficulty in finding sufficient people with ability and leisure to make up its numerous committees and sub-committees, in spite of its having co-opted members. What is the result? The work, as it is, has of necessity to be left to a very large extent to the officials, who have been so overburdened that many details are unattended to. This has been the case with the Local Government Board, which does not supervise under the present system the work of the Boards of Guardians, and the evil would increase with the proposed change. Further, I do not think that under the new scheme, the local committees would be composed of a superior class of people, as the Commissioners hope. Those who are willing to do the work, or, again, those who may have an axe to grind, would find a way of getting on the Committees, and few

others. Miss Octavia Hill, although she agrees with the majority in most of their conclusions, does not agree with the proposals regarding the statutory committee of the County Council for the following reasons :

- (1) It tends to the municipalization of the Poor Law.
- (2) It is comparatively untried machinery.
- (3) It is, at best, composed mainly of those elected for other duties and already overweighted with work.

Dr. Downes, whom I consider the most qualified and experienced member of the Commission, signed the majority report because of his "desire to support the principle, that public relief in every form should be administered and controlled by one local authority in each area": but he strongly dissents from the scheme of administration proposed by them. I cannot do better than quote his own words.

I view with grave misgiving the wholesale and imminent disruption of existing agencies and the transference of the work of relief to a complicated, untried, and, as I venture to think, unworkable system of machinery with manifold and inherent dangers.

Before adopting such measures he demands the most rigid proof of its necessity, the sufficiency of which he does not think supplied by either the majority or minority report.

I have been asked how these recommendations, if they become law, which I do not think they will do, will affect the interests of Catholics. I think that on the whole they are more favourable to those interests than the present system, or at any rate, not less favourable. Generally speaking, Catholic Guardians, too few though they are, have done their work well and consequently have nothing to fear.

I will now deal with the object of the Commissioners in recommending the enlargement of areas. Their main purpose is proper classification. They recommend that general work-houses should be abolished and seven different classes of institutions established in their place, respectively for

- (1) Children.
- (2) Aged and infirm.
- (3) Sick.
- (4) Able-bodied men.
- (5) Able-bodied women.
- (6) Vagrants.
- (7) Feeble-minded and epileptics.

Now, what are the facts of the present system? Excluding lunatics in asylums and casuals, more than thirty-eight per cent. of the indoor poor were in 1908 already provided for in specialized institutions quite apart from the ordinary workhouse, and the proportion for London was more than fifty per cent. I will go a little into detail on this subject in order the better to understand it thoroughly, and at the same time to show what is being done by the Catholic body to meet, out of our slender resources, the wants of the day. Taking the children first. At present there are in full working order the following methods of classification, viz. :

- (1) Infants under three years in nursery under special nurses.
- (2) Boys over three to Poor Law Schools, if healthy.
- (3) Boys boarded out within the Union, if healthy.
- (4) Boys boarded without the Union, if healthy.
- (5) Boys to Scattered Homes with foster mother.
- (6) Boys to Cottage Homes with foster mother and central home for administration.
- (7 to 11) Girls under the same conditions as above.
- (12) Imbeciles receiving-home.
- (13) Imbeciles training-home.
- (14) Training ship.
- (15) Ringworm and scalp disease cases.
- (16) Ophthalmia cases.
- (17) Mentally weak.
- (18) Seaside Houses for scrofulous cases.

Roman Catholic children are sent by Metropolitan Guardians to institutions under Catholic management as follows :

- (19) Boys who are healthy are sent to certified schools.
- (20) Boys under seven years of age to special schools for small children.
- (21) Girls to certified schools.
- (22) Boys and girls suffering from ringworm to special school.
- (23) Boys suffering from ophthalmia to special school.
- (24) Girls suffering from ophthalmia to special school.
- (26) Boys and girls who are feeble-minded to special school.
- (27) Boys and girls suffering from epilepsy to special school.
- (28) Boys and girls suffering from scrofula to special school.
- (29) Boys and girls suffering from consumption to special hospital.
- (30) Boys and girls, deaf and dumb, to special school.
- (31) Boys and girls, blind, to special school.
- (32 and 33) Boys' and girls' homes on leaving school.

Although I am conscious of the possibility of having missed some special institutions, still I have been able to mention *thirty-three* for children alone, no less than fourteen of them being for Roman Catholic children. With regard to adults, I may say that all the recommendations, and more besides, are already carried out in the Metropolis, except in some cases for the feeble-minded and epileptic. As regards these two classes there exists a great division of opinion as to the propriety of committing sufferers of this sort to end their days, long days for many of them, herded together. Many of the latter are very intelligent, and their fits are few and far between, but when compelled to live with others who have fits frequently, they undoubtedly tend to get worse. Again, as regards the feeble-minded, it cannot possibly improve a child or an adult so afflicted to be constantly in the company of similar sufferers. At the same time, there is this objection to allowing the feeble-minded to be taught with normal children, that it is very difficult for teachers to have to accommodate their level of instruction to the exigencies of several mentally deficient children. Still if the results of our special "feeble-minded" schools are not very good, as I believe they are not, why waste time and money in keeping them up?

If classification indicated above has been carried out in the Metropolis without special legislation, or without calling in the aid of a Royal Commission, why cannot the same be developed in the provinces? It undoubtedly can, but in the provinces they are much more considerate about the rates than we in London, and consequently the reforms will only come by degrees. All this classification is really the pivot upon which the reports of both the majority and minority turn, and rightly so, but we must be very careful not to carry it too far. Let me quote Dr. Downes again on this matter. He says:

There may, indeed, be a danger of classification being carried too far, to the verge of hardship, or even tyranny. The breaking up of families, the removal of old folk from their associates and friends, may outweigh many administrative advantages. And administrative difficulties may themselves arise of minor import compared with the above, but well to be remembered. Classification run to an ideal entails many practical difficulties, and even evils.

One thing about which every one is agreed, and which should be insisted upon at once by the Local Government

Board, is the removal of the remaining seven per cent. of children who live in workhouses.

Such subjects as out-relief, unemployment, and other matters, all of which call for special consideration, cannot be dealt with in the limits of this article, but one cannot help noticing a very strong flavour of the spirit of the Charity Organization Society running through the whole Report. Voluntary effort and charity come in for very severe criticism in many ways. No doubt there is waste and overlapping, and an effort should be made to improve some of the conditions now existing; but it smacks somewhat of Bumbledom to complain, for instance, of a poor person receiving relief from more than one source. I know of a respectable person seventy-five years of age receiving 3s. 6d. per week from the Guardians, out of which she pays 2s. 6d. rent; they knew she had nothing else, but would give no more. A friend, however, gave 3s. a week, and enabled the person to keep her home together. This form of charity comes under the ban of the Commissioners, who themselves draw comfortable incomes from various sources.

The subject of the children has received the close and careful attention of the authors of both Reports, and on a few points they seem to be in agreement. The minority, however, are very strong in their recommendations to remove all children from the care of the "Destitution Authorities;" whilst the majority are equally strong that they should remain under the "Public Assistance Authority." There are many strong reasons why they should be placed under the local education authorities as recommended by the minority, but unless the education authorities can be trusted not to attempt to starve the Catholic Faith out of our schools, the children had better remain as they are rather than run so terrible a risk. The over-inspection by Guardians which frequently takes place is a much less evil. The Guardians placing a Catholic child in a certified school have power to nominate *one* of their number from time to time to visit and report upon its condition, but, as things are, any number from three to eight may arrive at any time, especially during the summer months. Now, when the school contains children from as many as thirty unions, as frequently happens, it can be better imagined than described what trouble is caused by two or three of these deputations arriving at the same time. To this form of inspection some of our certified schools at the seaside are particularly exposed during the pleasant summer



months. The minority, however, complain that the Destitution Authorities and their officers are "unqualified to maintain an efficient inspection of the homes and institutions which they select for their children." I do not agree with them, but if it were so, the Local Government Board inspectors pay frequent visits, and, in addition, there is a committee of voluntary managers, who regularly inspect without notice. The minority cannot help admitting that the system "has much to recommend it."

The majority report, however, regarding our certified schools, is much more encouraging, and after saying some very hard things about other systems in use, which largely developed some years ago when the great cry went up against the "barrack school," they speak favourably of ours, and quote the remarks of the Chief Inspector of the Local Government Board, who said :

They are perhaps the best illustration of charity working in co-operation with the Poor Law. Good people start these homes; we certify them; the Guardians pay for the children going there; and we inspect them.

The following recommendation is a result of representations made to the Commissioners by the Catholic Guardians' Association.

In all cases of adoption, no person should be eligible as a foster-parent who does not profess the same religious belief as is indicated on the creed register of the child.

The Local Government Board receive but little criticism or praise, although it is not at all clear that many of the troubles which have existed have not been due to the apathy of some of the officials of that body. The Commissioners do, however, recommend a special department of the Local Government Board for Poor Law work to be called the "Public Assistance Division," and also an increase of staff. The former suggestion requires paper only, but the latter requires money, which may not be forthcoming, especially as they also recommend an increase of salary for the President, who already receives £2,000 a year. However, it is upon the President and the officials, the responsibility now rests to make good or bad use, or no use at all, of the results of the labours of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws.

T. G. KING.

## *The Dream of Gerontius and the Philosophy of St. Thomas.*

---

FROM the day that Mother Eve wept over the body of her son Abel, death has been full of mystery. For although this sudden change from life, with all its glorious possibilities, to an inert mass of matter is so easily paralleled by the ever-recurring phenomena of the organic world around us, there is deep down in the human heart a conviction that, for us at least, death is not the closing episode of an individual existence. So strong is this belief, so firmly is it implanted in the deep foundations of our nature, that even though the intellect be obscured by false philosophies and deems it to be fallacious, this craving for immortality will yet show itself in the overpowering sadness of an ineffaceable yearning for which there can be no fulfilment. No atheist can be free from a haunting thought of the Beyond, or indifferent to what we call the Absolute. We know—*how* it is difficult to say—that the body is but the flesh garment which a nobler something will one day flee from, and that in the reality of that something the personality will survive, but in some new form of being, so bereft of all that made up the activities of its former life that the imagination fails to picture its future conditions. The utmost it can do is to represent the disembodied souls enjoying pleasures or suffering pains similar in their ultimate analysis to the pleasures and pains of earth.

Yet, prescinding from the certain evidence of revelation, the proofs that philosophy affords for the fact of the soul's immortality are difficult to understand, while the obscurity of the whole question is further deepened by the imagination's impotence to provide any satisfactory picture of the after-life. This impossibility is an insuperable obstacle that besets the path of thinkers who fail to distinguish clearly between the operations of the purely spiritual intellect and those of the sensuous imagination. Consequently it has been regarded

not infrequently as showing the impossibility of life and existence without matter, and as proving the absurdity of the universally accepted dream of immortality—a delusive hope springing from the sheer nobility of the human heart. What a haunting sadness pervades those lines in which Omar Khayyam records his thoughts on this hope of life beyond the grave :

I sent my soul thro' the Invisible  
Some letter of the after life to spell,  
And by and by my soul returned to me  
And answered, "I myself am Heaven and Hell,"

Heaven but the vision of fulfilled desire,  
Hell but the shadow of a soul on fire,  
Cast on the darkness into which ourselves,  
So late emerged from, shall so soon expire.

Yet so strong is this sense of immortality that the literature of many nations contains poetic attempts to portray the life and surroundings of the spirits of the dead. To instance a classical example there is in the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid* a description of the journey of Aeneas through the under world to seek counsel from his father's shade. A world of shadowy bodies with a three-fold division—a Valhalla of heroes where the shades pursue those occupations which they found delightful in their earthly life, an embattled prison-house of torture for the wicked, and a neutral region thronged by those whose only crime was misfortune. But when the tale is all but told, a feeling of dissatisfaction seems to rise supreme in Virgil's mind, the poet gives place to the philosopher, and the prevailing scepticism of his day finds utterance in the concluding lines. There are, he tells us, two gates of sleep through which phantoms pass from world to world. One of dull horn, and through it true visions come; the other, gleaming with the dazzling polish of ivory, is the gateway of false dreams and idle hopes. It is significant that they who return from the nether world to tell the tale, pass through the ivory gate.

While the fact of immortality was certain among God's chosen people, little was known of the nature of the soul's destiny. All that Divine revelation had taught them might be summed up in the words of the Book of Wisdom, words full of steadfast hope in what was but dimly understood. "The souls of the just are in the hands of God, and the torments of death shall

not touch them ; they seemed to the eyes of fools to die, but they are in peace."

It was left for the New Testament, with its fuller manifestation of truth, to draw aside the veil slightly and give a clearer yet necessarily analogical knowledge of the mysteries of which death is the grim portal. St. John himself in the Apocalypse sets forth with all the grandeur of Oriental imagery the surpassing glory of the future Kingdom of the Messiah, and the terrific catastrophe of the last judgment day.

The first ten centuries of the Christian era witnessed a great development in religious thought. They saw the various articles of faith emerge from the state of half-implicit belief, saw them battle with error upon the fields of controversy, and finally saw them crowned by the Church in her conciliar definitions. When this epoch ended there arose the great scholastic thinkers who welded the vast but scattered theology of the Fathers into the solid order of a system. Revealed science and the wisdom of unaided reason were brought together that they might throw their united light over the universe of things with its twin mysteries of life and death. A rich store of materials was waiting in readiness for the loom of a great poetic imagination to weave them into the fabric of a mighty vision—such a vision as would make the hard objective truths of scholastic thought live with the subjective warmth and reality of personal experience. When all was ready Dante came, and the *Divine Comedy* was given to the world.

Yet there is one fragment of the after-life which down to our own times had not furnished a theme for a poet's art. What happens to a soul between the moment of death and the moment when the splendours of the Beatific Vision fall upon it? The little that philosophy has to teach us is rather by way of denial than of positive thought. We know that the separated soul finds itself in a world where dimensions have no place, and where the pulse of time does not beat. It finds itself a disembodied soul—an incomplete nature of naked spirituality, deprived at one blow of all natural possibility of enjoying the sensitive cognition that played so essential a part in the activities of its earthly life. The theme is a difficult one if the accuracy of the philosophy is not to be sacrificed ; as Dante would have handled it the keenness of the thought would have been dulled by the richness of his imagery. His symbolism was too strong in its texture. It is a subject more suitable for the delicate

genius of the miniature painter, than for the colossal power of the panoramic artist. Such a subtle psychological study of a dawning consciousness is fraught with the utmost difficulty, and is one that calls for the rarest mental qualities for its production. The difficulty is at once apparent when the relations between intellect and imagination are called to mind. The imagination is the treasure-house of the senses, and its contents form the stores of metaphor and imagery for the intellect. This, however, is its least important function. Its supreme necessity arises from the fact that the intellect in this present state of existence, wholly depends upon pictures fashioned by the imagination, as models on which to mould its thoughts. Hence the human mind has no direct outlook upon the world of pure spirit with its concentrated presence and more perfect duration. Its outlook is through the imagination on the world of matter with its realities diluted by space and time. As Carlyle says, space and time are the warp and woof of the universal canvas on which all our conceptions are painted. "In vain while here on earth shall you endeavour to strip them off; you can at best but rend them for moments and look through." Consequently no imagery drawn from things of time and space can represent the higher realities of instantaneous duration and unextended presence. It is dangerous for the lofty subtleties of philosophic thought to wed themselves with sensuous metaphor. Music indeed hints at them, but it cannot express them.

Yet in the *Dream of Gerontius*, so far as philosophy may without detriment consort with poetry, Newman has brought them together; as far as poetry may be used to lend a warmth to abstract speculation, so far has Newman used it. His especial fitness for the task he set himself lay in his blended genius, at once in his rare power of metaphysic, and if we may be allowed the phrase, in the limpid spirituality of his imagination. As a result, beneath the literary charm of the poem the cultured mind discovers hidden in every line the depths of thought that belong to the writings of the great Angelic Doctor.

In order to appreciate the philosophy which underlies the description of Gerontius' gradual realization of the changed circumstances of his being, the theory must be called to mind which the old Scholastics borrowed from Aristotle to explain the mutual relations of mind and matter in man's composite essence. According to Plato's doctrine the human soul is a

pure spirit thrust at some intermediate period of its existence into a prison-house of matter where its energies are cramped and confined, and from which it is liberated only by death. In opposition to this view Aristotle taught that soul and body were from the first designed as the twin principles of our essence, depending mutually upon one another for the perfection of their being.<sup>1</sup> Thus while the soul gives reality and human dignity to the matter it informs, this matter in return enables the soul to possess that differentiated extended being without which sense-activity is impossible. From Plato's theory it would follow that since union with matter cramps the soul's power of thought, death would enable it to return to its natural state, where its intellectual horizon would be indefinitely extended and its intellect, asserting its strength, would rival in its operations the swift, far-reaching vision of the angelic mind. But St. Thomas, following Aristotle, and he himself followed by the Schoolmen, opposed the theories of pre-natal existence and innate ideas and laid down as a fundamental principle that for man the senses are the natural channels of knowledge and that the intellect, though purely spiritual, is wholly dependent upon the sensuous imagination in which all sense-perceptions are gathered, combined, and stored for models on which to fashion its ideas. Since death is a penalty and the direct result of the loss of the gift of integrity by which harmony was established between the discordant elements of mind and matter, it is an event not primarily contemplated in the creation of our nature. It seems clear from revelation that had not sin shattered man's essence, body and soul would have known no separation, that the continuity of sense-perception would have been unbroken, and the translation to a state of glory but super-added a loftier mode of cognition without destroying, or in any way interrupting the lower. But in the actual state of things the soul, by the loss of the body, is deprived at once of all those channels of knowledge which belong to its nature, and since it is suffering a penalty it can lay no claim to those loftier sources of thought which are proper to the angelic intellect. Moreover, it is to be remembered that it cannot possess the fulness and perfection of knowledge until, its judgment over, it has passed through the cleansing flames of Purgatory.

<sup>1</sup> Hence the feeling of "masterful negation and collapse" which precedes Gerontius' dissolution.

A disembodied soul thou hast by right  
No converse with aught else beside thyself.

But the power of communion with itself is unimpaired, for death does not destroy the intellectual memory. Rather it unrolls the whole scroll and lights it up so that every incident of conscious life, with even its microscopic details, presents itself vividly to the intensified consciousness of the soul. The deprivation of all companionship and absolute abandonment constitutes an awful solitude which, were it not in God's providence that some means of communication were given, would freeze the soul with horror.

This silence pours a solitariness  
Into the very essence of my soul;  
And the deep rest so soothing and so sweet,  
Hath something too of the sternness and of pain.  
For it drives back my thoughts upon their spring  
By a strange introversion and perforce  
I now begin to feed upon myself,  
Because I have naught else to feed upon.

Therefore the guardian spirit informs Gerontius a little later

Lest so stern a solitude should load  
And break thy being, in mercy are vouchsafed  
Some lower measures of perfection.

St. Thomas teaches that since the disembodied soul is for a time in the state of an Angel, so far as its needs of cognition are concerned, its state of intellectual destitution is relieved by an imperfect participation in the angelic ways of thought. Consequently its new ideas are obtained no longer from the operations of the intellect upon the perceptions of sense but from a direct but very imperfect participation of Divine light. For poetic purposes Newman has very beautifully combined this doctrine with yet another fragment of scholasticism, and though the result may be regarded as a literary expedient it may not be destitute of probability. Whatever be the condition of a human soul, whether it be actually joined to the body or in a state of separated existence, it always differs essentially from Angelic substance in that its nature postulates, for its completion and perfection, union with matter and the enjoyment of sensitive cognition. This is a fundamental law of its being. But while this actual enjoyment of sense cognition requires organized matter, the separated soul, though not able to put forth its powers as active sources of knowledge, remains radically



sensitive, and its powers may be made the subjects of illusions wrought upon them by an external agency—illusions which do not deceive, but which yet conceal even while revealing the truths of which they give symbolic knowledge.

And thou art wrapped and swathed around in dreams  
Dreams that are true yet enigmatical  
For the belongings of thy present state  
Save through such symbols come not home to thee  
And thus thou tellest of space, and time, and size,  
Of fragrant, solid, bitter, musical,  
Of fire and of refreshment after fire.

On the other hand its new condition is brought home to it by a feeling of

An inexpressive lightness and a sense of freedom.

These dreams of sense and unobliterated ways of thought, half deceive it into believing that it is yet united to the body :

. . . for I possess  
A sort of confidence which clings to me  
That each particular organ holds its place  
As heretofore, combining with the rest  
Into one symmetry, that wraps me round  
And makes me man.

But though the radical powers of touch, taste, and hearing are the subjects of these illusionary perceptions, there is "not a glimmer of that princely sense which binds ideas in one, and makes them live." The sense of sight in a measure far beyond that of the other senses, assures us of the objectivity of what we know of the external world. It convinces us that sense perceptions are no mere projections of states of consciousness upon external nothingness. Whatever information the other senses gather and store in the imagination, this information groups itself round in a subsidiary and explanatory manner and gives a further depth and breadth to the revelations of the sense of sight. Consequently a disembodied soul possessing symbolic illusions in its lower sense-powers must move in a dim dreamland of scattered consciousness. It is destitute of any principle of cohesion by which to co-ordinate them into unity. At once therefore there enters into our conception of such a state, the element of unreality and incompleteness that suggests, so far as it can be analogically suggested, the consciousness of a separated soul. Hence the very perception of the presence of his guardian

angel comes to Gerontius, although a vague sense of gentle pressure by which the embracing care of the guardian spirit is revealed :

Some one has me fast  
Within his ample palm ; tis not a grasp  
Such as they use on earth but all around  
Over the surface of my subtle being.

Probably in no part of the *Dream of Gerontius* are poetry and philosophy more exquisitely blended than in the description of the soul's gradual realization of the new duration which now measures the acts of its existence.

St. Thomas teaches that the idea of time is consequent on and essentially dependent upon the idea of local movement. While motion is the mere passing of a body from one position to another, considered purely in relation to the changes of position involved, time is the same series of changes considered in their order of succession among themselves. The peculiar property of all movements of matter is, that they are gradual and continual. This property is ultimately rooted in quantity, the most fundamental and characteristic accident of material substance, and from which arises its extension. Since then the whole specific nature of time arises from the nature of local motion, and that in turn from the nature of extended continuous surface, it is clear that space and time possess a common ultimate origin in extension. Indeed, once more to use a metaphor that must not be pressed, time is a diluted form of duration and space a diluted form of presence, and in either case the diluting element is "quantity."

But if we try to imagine or think positively of a duration and presence that is neither extended nor continuous, we are hopelessly baffled, since our present knowledge of such a world is by analogical concepts. At best the imagination endeavours to picture a point which has position without size or magnitude, or an instant which is not even a fragment of time. Both are the negations of the whole perfection of the genus to which they belong.

Moreover, such phantasms are hopelessly useless for two reasons. Firstly, because the representation of a point (and also an instant), is entirely outside the powers of a sensuous faculty. Such an attempt at a representation bears as much resemblance to a point as does a clumsy dot on a blackboard. Secondly, it is equally certain that a negation of the whole

perfection of extension takes us yet further from the knowledge of a duration and presence far more perfect than time and space.

Yet an angel's life is made up not of long or short durations, of hours or minutes, but of instants, perfect, indivisible, unextended. Yet our lives are not made up of instants any more than matter is made up of points. Two so-called instants in time, if really successive, are not two, but one; yet in an angel's life they remain distinct. They are two because the difference is founded upon two different acts—they are instantaneous because they are free from any principle of extension, thus mirroring in a more perfect, yet still infinitely imperfect way, the external, unfailing, ever-present instant of Him who is without change or shadow of change. From the continuous nature of the movement of matter, it is clear that just as we may, by passing two surfaces in contact, find by coincidence the corresponding parts, so by comparing two motions proceeding simultaneously we can express their mutual relation. Hence by comparing all movements with some regular, unceasing movement, which is generally observable, we get a common standard by which these movements become comparable among themselves. If, however, there were but one motion in existence, or many motions incapable of comparison, then, fast or slow, being relative terms, could have no application. Each would be its own standard, which is equivalent to saying that it would have no standard, and, therefore, speaking strictly, no rate.

Consequently

Spirits and men by different standards mete  
The less and greater in the flow of time,  
By sun and moon, primeval ordinances—  
By stars that rise and set harmoniously,  
By the recurring seasons and the swing,  
This way and that, of the suspended rod  
Precise and punctual men divide the hours  
Equal and continuous for their common use.

But the absence of the principle of extension from the nature of a pure spirit, precludes all possibility of comparing the acts of one angel with the acts of another, so that with them

time is not a common property,  
But what is long is short and swift is slow  
And near is distant as received and grasped  
By this mind and by that and everyone,  
Is standard of his own chronology.

Consequently, as the idea of rate is inadmissible, the sole basis of comparison between the duration of angelic acts is the output of its energy, so that

intervals in their succession  
Are measured by the living thought alone  
And grow or wane with its intensity.

A glimpse of this truth may be obtained from the consideration of the phenomenon of the apparently huge interval of time lived through during a short period of great mental stress. The rate at which our phantasms succeed one another in our imagination is, roughly speaking, a constant under normal conditions. During periods of mental disturbance this rate is greatly increased, and the mind, unable to realize this, becomes impressed with the fallacious idea of vastly extended duration. The energy of a drowning man's thought is said to be such that he lives his whole life over in a few seconds. De Quincey has left on record the effect of opium upon his dreams.

The sense of space [he says], and in the end the sense of time, became powerfully affected. Buildings, landscapes, &c., were exhibited in proportion so vast as the bodily eye is not fitted to receive. Space swelled, and was amplified to a sense of unutterable and self-repeating infinity. This disturbed me less than the vast expansion of time. Sometimes I seemed to have lived for seventy or a hundred years in one night; nay more, had feelings representative of a duration far beyond the limits of any human experience.

But the duration of the angelic act and being utterly transcends our imagination, and the very terminology we are bound to use is borrowed from the terminology of time, and to a great extent is false in its inevitable connotations. Time and space are thick veils which cut us off from the spirit world of concentrated presence and instantaneous act. Rend these veils we cannot. We must be content to know darkly what is beyond until the dim twilight of our cognition shall orb into the full vision of perfect day. Throughout the whole episode of the "dream" no duration of time restrains the soul of Gerontius from penetrating into the presence of his Judge.

It is the very energy of thought,  
Which keeps thee from thy God.

The Church teaches that between the instant of death and the instant of judgment no length of time intervenes, and Newman, strictly adhering to this theological truth, points out that in the measure of time these conversations and events in no way destroy the immediate sequence of the judgment.

"What lets me now from going to my God," asks the soul of Gerontius, and the angel replies :

Thou art not let, but with extremest speed  
Art hurrying to the Just and Holy Judge ;  
For scarcely art thou disembodied yet ;  
Divide a moment as men measure time  
Into its million-million-millionth part  
Yet even less than that the interval  
Since thou did leave the body, and the priest  
Cried "*Subvenite*," and they fell to prayer,  
Nay, scarcely yet have they begun to pray.

When therefore the soul's journey is over, and it is ushered into the presence of its God, the fact that the seeming length of its experiences bears no relation to the lapse of time is brought home to it by the coincidence of its judgment with the echoing prayers of those whom it has left behind on earth.

There is perhaps more than appears on the surface in the symbolism of music in this poem. Music, the most spiritual and mysterious of the arts, had a special message for Newman. Of all those shadows of the Infinite with which we are surrounded, music had for him the deepest meaning. To him it was no "mere ingenuity or trick of art."<sup>1</sup> "The musician sweeps the strings and they thrill with ecstatic meaning."<sup>2</sup>

Is it possible [he asks] that the inexhaustible evolution and disposition of notes, so rich yet so simple, so intricate yet so majestic, should be a mere sound which is gone and perishes? Can it be that those mysterious strivings of heart and keen emotion and strange yearnings after we know not what, and awful impressions from we know not where, should be wrought in us by what is unsubstantial and goes and ends in itself? It is not so ; it cannot be. No, they have escaped from some higher sphere, they are an outpouring of an eternal harmony in the medium of created sound ; they are echoes from our home ; they are the voice of angels ; or the Magnificat of Saints ; or the living laws of Divine Governance, or the Divine attributes, something they are besides themselves which we cannot compass, which we cannot utter.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Oxford University Sermons*, p. 346, Edit. 1884.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* Discourse, ix. 230.

<sup>3</sup> *Oxford University Sermons*, pp. 346, 347.

An especial characteristic in Newman's spiritual constitution was his yearning for home. The home that he found in the Catholic Church, after years of wandering, was to him a type and a symbol of that home where for ever we shall gaze in peace and unfailing contentment upon the face of our Father. To this absorbing desire, to this straining forward to the things beyond the veil, to this spiritual home-sickness, must be ascribed the *Dream of Gerontius*.

It is the expression of secret thoughts of one whose supreme hope in life was to pass *ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem*—from the shadows and symbols of earth into the full splendours of the unveiled Truth beyond.

T. A. NEWSOME.

## *Souls for Sale.*

---

"DID you ever see such idolatry?"

The speaker was an English woman, clad in the severe uncompromising garb affected by a certain type of British tourist abroad, and armed with the inevitable Baedeker, and the scene was a dusky fresco-adorned church in a hillside town in Italy.

Tapers gleamed upon the altar, the haunting strains of a hymn sung lustily by the assembled *contadine* rose and fell upon the incense-laden air, while the officiating priest raised on high a relic of the Madonna with which he blessed the congregation.

"Disgraceful, I call it!" murmured the first speaker in her companion's ear. The latter regarded her somewhat timidly. She was never quite sure what her outspoken fellow-traveller would say or do next, and this same outspokenness had before now led her into some rather awkward situations.

"I don't suppose they look upon it in that light," she whispered hurriedly.

"Of course they don't; they have no light, poor benighted creatures," returned her friend. "But it is idolatry all the same, and I wonder at you, Laura, making excuses for them like that!"

Laura Blair,—she was a fair blue-eyed girl of three or four and twenty,—smiled deprecatingly. In her heart she was inclined to sympathize with the devotion of these simple souls, and just now, for private reasons of her own, she was more than a little interested in the Catholic faith. But sympathy and her present companion were poles apart, and it was on this account,—so said the latter's acquaintances,—that her husband preferred the fogs of an English winter to the sunny skies of Italy, when gazed at in the society of his energetic wife. Mr. Fenton was a peace-loving individual who concerned himself not at all about the religious views of other people, a subject in which on the



contrary, Mrs. Fenton took the liveliest interest. And this was the special hobby which she was now engaged in riding in Italy. As a country it appealed to her but slightly. As a field for the propagation of the Gospel, pure and undiluted, it entirely satisfied the cravings of her soul. There are some natures which are apparently unsusceptible to beauty in any form. They profess admiration for that which they are told to admire in architecture or art, but the lasting impression which to others differently endowed renders a "thing of beauty" a veritable "joy for ever," is in their case conspicuous only by its absence, and although they are far from being aware of the fact,—they are in this respect at any rate most deserving objects of pity. Mrs. Fenton could and did gaze unmoved at the masterpieces of Italy's greatest painters, and she invariably alluded to the scenery as "pretty." When, however, it was a question of what she described as "rescuing a brand from the burning," namely inducing indifferent Catholics to profess, for the sake of material advantages, belief in a creed of which they knew nothing and in reality cared less, she was all enthusiasm, and her zeal blazed up like a fire on a frosty day. In Rome and Florence, she had been occasionally successful. When an Italian is very poor, in want of all the necessities of life and not especially devout, he, or she, is apt to barter the practice of their religion for the flesh-pots of Egypt. Which fact, however, never really makes Protestants of them and also never prevents them from clamouring for a priest when they die. In the country, remote from the corrupting influences of a big town she found the task more difficult, and here, especially in this picturesque village, mediæval in its character and surroundings, she foresaw failure. For it was not only the women who went to Mass, but the men also, and the young men too, which from her point of view aggravated the matter.

Benediction was over, and she and Laura Blair paused for a moment in the quaint little piazza outside the church. The brief twilight had given place to darkness and the purple mountains were shrouded by the veil of night. The younger of the two women leant her arms on the wall, her eyes fixed absently on the brown roofs below her and the green valley beyond. Presently Mrs. Fenton broke the silence.

"I have seen a good deal since I have been in this country which has astonished me, but I think the peasantry here are quite the most benighted we have come across. The idea of

worshipping what they call a relic! And do you think they can possibly imagine it has the remotest connection with the Virgin Mary?"

Laura's foot tapped impatiently on the ground. There were moments—and this was emphatically one of them—when she felt in entire sympathy with her companion's husband, sitting safe and secluded in his study in West Kensington.

"Whether it has or has not has very little to do with it," she said quietly, "these people are full of simple faith, faith which takes everything for granted, and of course they believe it is all right and authentic, so that their devotion is quite as edifying as if what the priest held up to bless them with was really what it claims to be."

"Simple faith!" echoed Mrs. Fenton in the tone of one who is inclined to doubt the testimony of her own ears. "Is it possible it is you, Laura, who are talking such—such heresy, I don't know what else to call it? And you used to be such a good churchwoman too! But I know what it is," she added significantly, "it is Hugh Campbell's influence. A pervert, and a red-hot one at that, is always more extreme in these matters than those who have had the misfortune to be born Roman Catholics, and you take everything he says for gospel."

The colour rushed to the girl's cheeks.

"Indeed, you are quite mistaken, Mrs. Fenton," she replied indignantly. "What I say has nothing to do with Mr. Campbell. I,—I have always thought the faith of the Italian peasants was a thing to be admired."

"You must be a great admirer of folly in that case," remarked Mrs. Fenton witheringly. "But it is getting cold, let us go indoors."

And it was with a mutual sense as of slightly strained relations that they returned to the little *Pension* where they had taken rooms. The following day Mrs. Fenton began her missionary labours in real earnest. That moment when the silver reliquary had been raised on high to bless the kneeling crowd had convinced her, if conviction were needed, that her work for the present lay here in this remote spot far from civilization, where the purple crests of the Apennines kept watch and ward over the cobble-paved sombre-roofed village. The towns were bad enough, but here, so it seemed to her, idolatry and superstition had reached their apotheosis. But she was by no means sure of success, and her first efforts confirmed

her presentiment of failure. Assunta was a widow with six children, barefooted, and more or less sketchy with regard to costume. They were also, one and all, very much in want of food, not to mention such details as soap and water. Mrs. Fenton approached her with practical offers of assistance, which at first were favourably received, but when they were followed by the suggestion that Assunta herself should leave off going to Mass and frequenting the Sacraments, and that the children should be sent to a Protestant institution in Rome, the peasant woman arose in her wrath and refused to accept any money at all on these conditions, and so remained mistress of the situation.

Failure, however, is sometimes the forerunner of success, and a few days after her first defeat Mrs. Fenton reaped the fruits of victory. Giovanni, the shoemaker, had lately lost his wife, and was left with one little daughter of eight years old on his hands. And Giovanni's religious practices were not all that they might have been. Trade was slack and money was scarce, and altogether he was quite in the mood to be tempted when the devil, disguised in the somewhat portly form of the English "Signora," crossed his path. Marietta, the little girl, was playing in the dusty road outside the shop as Mrs. Fenton passed by, and she stopped to speak to her.

"What is your name?" she inquired in Italian. Notwithstanding a decidedly British accent she spoke the language well, having taken pains to acquire the knowledge on account of her proposed missionary labours.

The child looked up at her and showed her white teeth in a broad smile.

"Marietta," she lisped.

Mrs. Fenton regarded her with disapprobation in her gaze.

"Humph! After the Virgin, I suppose! And do you pray to the Madonna, child?"

Marietta nodded her curly head.

"Yes, every day," she said promptly, quite confident that her answer would be agreeable to the "Signora."

"But it is very wrong of you," returned Mrs. Fenton, and her listener's brown eyes grew round with astonishment. "Is your father in?"

Marietta pointed with one grimy little finger in the direction of the shop.

"In there," she faltered, feeling rather bewildered with the

turn affairs had taken. And Mrs. Fenton, with her nose in the air, entered the shoemaker's workshop.

Giovanni proved more amenable than her former experiences with Assunta had led her to hope. As long as someone else was willing to provide for his daughter it was apparently all one to him in what religion she was brought up, and Mrs. Fenton left him with triumph written large on her expressive countenance.

"There is one sensible man in this benighted village," she announced on her return to the *Pension*.

Laura looked up from the letter she was writing.

"Who is he?" she inquired. "And why is he sensible?"

And Mrs. Fenton told the story of her morning's experiences, while Laura Blair listened in silence, and with a distinct feeling of disappointment and disapproval.

"So he is willing to sell his child's soul for money?" she remarked when her friend paused expectantly for the congratulations which she felt to be her due.

"Really, Laura, what extraordinary expressions you do make use of!" she exclaimed indignantly.

"I consider that I have saved that child's soul, and so ought you if you are a good English churchwoman."

"In that case I suppose I can't be," returned Laura calmly, "for I certainly think you have no business to interfere with the convictions of other people."

"Rubbish!" retorted Mrs. Fenton. "Do you call it interfering with the convictions of other people when we send out missionaries to convert the heathen? It's the same thing."

"Not quite," said Laura, rising as she spoke. "But as we don't agree on this subject, perhaps we had better not discuss it." And she left the room, Mrs. Fenton gazing after her in amazement. Three days later, Marietta was sent to Rome to be brought up and instructed in the Protestant religion, and Giovanni, although a little overcome by the remonstrances of the parish priest, still remained obdurate and expressed his intention of not offending his benefactress.

"It is better to please the *forestieri*," he remarked with conviction to one of his boon companions at the Osteria.

"It is they who have the money, and the priests can only give us advice which costs them nothing!"

And Cesaro, rather envious of his good luck, agreed with him.

So for a time the world went well with Giovanni, and then all of a sudden there came a bolt from the blue. The shoemaker was struck down with typhoid fever, and for days his life trembled in the balance. And at last one evening, as the sun was setting in a bank of amber and rose-tipped clouds, the priest told him that his hours on earth were numbered and that he had better make his confession and die at peace with God.

Giovanni shuddered.

"Die!" he exclaimed. "But I am a great sinner. I have given up my child to the devil. What can I do?"

And the priest, an old white-haired man with a calm, placid face and an intense zeal for souls, told him exactly what he should do, and the Signora Inglese was sent for and arrived promptly, armed with a bundle of tracts, quite prepared to improve the occasion. To her astonishment and disappointment, however, she very soon discovered that her services in that line were not required. The priest had the courage of his opinions, and that is by no means an invariable accompaniment to sanctity in sunny Italy—or indeed always elsewhere—and he expressed his displeasure at her recent conduct in no measured terms. Giovanni, comfortably oblivious of his own part in the performance, joined in, and Mrs. Fenton, having also vouchsafed to both her listeners a graphically worded description of what she thought of them, retired from the scene—worsted in the conflict.

But, after all, Giovanni recovered, and to the day of his death, which occurred many years later, he believed that the Madonna had restored him to health because of his repentance with regard to the sale of his daughter's soul.

Some sixteen months afterwards Hugh Campbell and his wife were spending their honeymoon in Italy, and amongst other places they paid a flying visit to the little hillside town. It was June, and the fire-flies sparkled by night like jewels in the corn, and the nightingales warbled their love-songs in the chestnut woods. On the evening they arrived the bride and bridegroom lingered in the piazza outside the church to watch the glowing tints of the sunset.

"Well, after all," remarked Laura, continuing an interrupted conversation, "she did not do very much harm here in spite of all her efforts."

Hugh Campbell's face darkened.

"It was the people's faith which saved them," he said. "But she is none the less to be condemned because she was unsuccessful. It is incalculable the harm that is done in Italy by English and American Protestants, Methodists, Wesleyans,—what you will,—and it is the bounden duty of every Catholic belonging to these two nations to counteract the evil, as far as lies in their power."

Laura looked up at him with a tender light in her eyes.

"We will, Hugh," she murmured. "We will do it together."

And as they stood there in silence the bells of the *Ave Maria* rang out over the little town, and the peace of the summer evening sank into their souls.

GRACE V. CHRISTMAS.

## *Flotsam and Jetsam.*

---

### **Catholics and the Press.**

WHAT is there about the profession of Nonconformity that destroys the sense of humour? We find plenty of admirable qualities in the "Free Churches"—spiritual energy, prayerfulness, works of mercy, a sense of sin. The very tenacity with which they hold their views, the very truculence with which they seek to impose them upon others, are not without a bracing effect upon a Laodicean age. But of humour, conscious humour, they show no trace. Not otherwise can we account for the manner in which our modern Titus Oates, Mr. Joseph Hocking, was received at the recent Free Church Council. He told the assembled delegates there about a certain Popish Plot for the destruction of their liberties, the chief evidence of which was the fact that the secular Press of England is on the whole dominated by Catholic influences. This assertion, instead of being welcomed by the audience with the shouts of laughter, the convulsions of hilarity, which its wild extravagance demanded, provoked murmurs of indignation and cries of, Shame! No one, in fact, saw the joke. Yet the joke was there, as large as life. There is nothing in the Collected Works of Mark Twain to surpass it in audacity and unexpectedness. The fine flower of Nonconformity was present, not selected presumably on grounds of mental obtuseness, yet a witticism of no little merit was not even afforded the tribute of a solitary guffaw. Are we not justified, then, in surmising that the Free Church atmosphere induces the atrophy of a faculty which does so much to make life tolerable—and men tolerant? But Mr. Hocking's joke suffered even a worse fate. Unrecognized in the place of its birth, it went forth wistfully into the greater world outside, only to meet there also solemn faces, and to be taken seriously! The Press received it without a smile—a fact which suggests that the atmosphere it encountered was



very little changed, in other words, that our chief papers also are officered and staffed by Nonconformists! Be that as it may, Fleet Street, whose midriff should have been shaking with mirth, set itself solemnly to explain that it really does *not* burke Protestant news and give undue prominence to Catholic, that its leaders are *not* "censored" at Archbishop's House, that its Roman and Viennese and Parisian correspondents are *not* in the pay of the Pope, that its stories of escaped nuns, its travesties of Catholic doctrines, its denial of the Church's claims, its misreading of history, are not so many Jesuitical devices to throw the Protestant sleuth-hounds off the scent. If Mr. Hocking's object was to "draw" the Press, he is to be congratulated on his success. No one thought of asking him for proofs. Titus Oates himself was not more immune from inconvenient inquiries. But if he had been asked, his simple answer was ready—"There are none. Rome's secret agents do their work too thoroughly to leave traces; it is the essence of their craft to plot unperceived; Catholic journalists make a practice of not wearing a label in their hats to proclaim their creed. This very absence of evidence is the strongest confirmation of my assertion." Trusting, therefore, to the obtuseness of his audience and of the Press, Mr. Hocking made his whimsical charge, aroused his sensation, and got his advertisement. He then left the stage, so to speak, to make room for an older and more experienced exponent of Romish machinations. In a letter dated March 15th, and published in the *Daily News*, Dr. Horton, whose neglect by the Papist-ridden Press Mr. Hocking had feelingly deplored, assumes his familiar rôle of scare-monger, and, as was to be expected, gives us a far more finished performance than his disciple. But alas! his interpretation of the part is not consistent. Mr. Hocking made a great point of the hidden nature of the danger that threatens the unsuspecting public. But Dr. Horton says that his disciple merely gave utterance to a knowledge

which is burning and working in the minds of millions of quiet Englishmen, whose spirit is slow to find expression, but swift to act when the time is ripe.

Observe that our alarmist cannot resist the desire to have the feeling of numbers at his back, however destructive its expression is to the force of his main contention. He has already, by the way, told us elsewhere that the vast majority of

the people in this country are indifferent to religion,<sup>1</sup> and so he must find those millions to whom the delinquencies of the Press are no secret in the small remnant of practical Nonconformists.

We may pause here to notice that the credit of the discovery of Rome's manipulation of the Press is due on every ground of priority of detection and exposure to Dr. Horton. Mr. Hocking at the Council merely borrowed, with due leave, we trust, and acknowledgment, the Doctor's thunder. Before the novelist was widely heard of, whilst indeed he was still engaged in composing that deathless romance—*The Scarlet Woman*, Dr. Horton had made the flesh of a Free Church gathering creep by announcing

that a fair hearing for anti-Romanist teaching was practically unobtainable in the ordinary newspapers and that this result was due to subtle influences behind the scenes of which most people were entirely ignorant.<sup>2</sup>

This must have been before the millions of quiet but slow-thinking Englishmen, who are now inflamed with the knowledge, got wind of the matter. It was, to be precise, nearly eleven years ago, which suggests that these "scares" have the same periodicity as sun-spots. However that may be, if the *Daily News* and the *Westminster Gazette* would only search their files for November, 1898, they would find how exactly history repeats itself. The fatuous accusation repeated to-day was then made by Dr. Horton at a meeting, called curiously enough the "Nonconformist Political Council" (there was less show of compromise about the epithet in those days), and it was also "loudly cheered" by the audience, and received the subsequent endorsement of Mr. Silas Hocking, an elder brother of Joseph's, endowed, it would appear, with a similar talent for fiction. Then, there were the same showers of correspondence, and the same solemn disclaimers in the Press, all *en règle*. Observers, if our surmise be correct, may look for the occurrence of similar phenomena in the year 1920, unless in the meantime Dr. Horton's "quiet Englishmen" should add to their intellectual equipment the power of seeing a joke.<sup>3</sup>

To return, now, to Dr. Horton's share in the present episode. His contribution lacks the bluntness, the definiteness, the crude-

<sup>1</sup> See *My Belief*, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> The *Westminster Gazette*, November 19th, 1898.

<sup>3</sup> Our readers may find this former episode fully discussed by Mr. Britten in our issue for December, 1902, under the title of "Catholics and the Press." It is to be regretted that this article is not available at the moment as a C.T.S. pamphlet.

ness, of Mr. Hocking's. Rendered wary by experience, he has come to take as his mottoes in controversy—"Keep to generalities," "avoid first-hand references," "insinuate rather than assert," "mention no names." His care is not to burn his boats nor cut himself off from means of retreat. Yet in spite of all precautions, he does stumble now and then, mentioning, for instance, the name of a particular convent in connection with an onslaught on conventual institutions, or, as in the present case, the name of a newspaper in connection with a charge against the Press. Let our readers compare the following passages, both taken from the *Daily News*.

*Dr. Horton's statement,*  
March 16.

Some well-known organs, *e.g.*, *The Academy*, have passed into Roman hands. That once famous literary paper now passes its verdict on our current literature with the bias of Rome. Good books are those which favour Rome. Books which criticize or oppose Rome are, *ipso facto*, bad. This paper is, therefore, to be ranked (though the public does not know it) with the *Tablet*, the *Month*, or the *Universe*. This is all quite legitimate, but the reading public should know when a paper becomes an organ of the Roman propaganda.

*The "Daily News" withdrawal,*  
March 17.

We are asked to state in reference to a passage in Dr. Horton's letter . . . that none of the directors of *The Academy* is a Roman Catholic. Lord Alfred Douglas, the Editor, is not a Roman Catholic, Mr. T. W. H. Crosland, a director, is a Protestant and the son of a Protestant, Sir Edward Tennant, M.P., is a Protestant, and the second largest shareholder is also a Protestant.

We are also informed that . . . the books are reviewed for the columns of *The Academy* by those who are best capable of dealing with them from a literary standpoint: and that, further, those who are responsible for the management of the paper are unable to find an instance of any book that has been treated in the manner described by Dr. Horton.

It is seldom that Dr Horton is brought to book so soon and so completely as that—too seldom for his deserts. No doubt he looks upon it as a splendid illustration of his thesis that anti-Romanist teaching cannot get a fair hearing in the Press, but he himself added an apology in the same paper on the following day, giving as the explanation of his mistake two reasons which are excellent types of those on which he habit-

ually bases his judgments of Catholicism. He says in effect that he was convinced that *The Academy* was Catholic, because a book of his had been discussed therein from the "Roman point of view" and, on enquiry, a journalistic friend had told him that the journal had passed into Roman Catholic hands. Thereupon the Hortonian imagination sets to work and embroiders the original fiction thus. The paper, instead of being an isolated instance, becomes at once a type. "Some well-known organs, e.g. *The Academy*." Again, "that once-famous literary paper now passes its verdict on our current literature with the bias of Rome." Here, the Doctor's precious volume, by the same imaginative touch, stands for "our current literature." Our readers have had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the book in question, it being no other than that preposterous production, entitled *My Belief*, which was noticed in our pages last July,<sup>1</sup> and so they may judge what sort of treatment it deserved at the hands of any fair-minded, straight-thinking Christian. As for his information as distinct from his inference—it proves equally fallacious. He has such an incurable habit of readily accepting anything however absurd that falls in with his prepossessions that, in matters of controversy, he is the dupe of every silly rumour. We gave several instances of this failing of Dr. Horton's in the critique referred to above, and many more may be found in an amusing article written on this very subject of hearsay evidence against Catholicism by Mr. Britten.<sup>2</sup> The one lesson Dr. Horton seems incapable of assimilating, in spite of all our efforts to teach him, is that serious charges should be supported on serious evidence, and that the *first* duty of the accuser is to ascertain beyond reasonable doubt the truth of his accusation.

In this case, then, on the word of a journalist which bore out his own suspicions, he proceeded to accuse an honourable paper of a dishonest course of action, just as on even more flimsy evidence he accused a religious community of cruelty. As we have more than once implied, nothing but the strong arm of the law can avail to keep within due bounds a mind like this, which religious bigotry has so unhinged that trifles light as air seem to its prejudices confirmation strong as proofs of Holy Writ. In the course of his letter to the *Daily News* he gravely asserts that Catholics, by means of their "Apostolate of the Press" (by which phrase he seemingly wishes to imply that there is some organ-

<sup>1</sup> See "A Study in Bigotry." *THE MONTH*, July, 1908, p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> See "What the Soldier said." *THE MONTH*, February, 1899.

ization with that title) have apparently secured on all the papers an agent, whose business it is to excise any piece of news, any paragraph in a speech or any notice of a book which tells against Rome and that, by dint of the same Apostolate, when anything "injurious to the Roman conversion of England" does escape the notice of this agent and manages to get printed, "the Editor is immediately assailed with protests, denials, threats of legal proceedings, etc., which to him appear like the rising of an indignant public opinion." Here we have, perhaps, the true cause of Dr. Horton's alarm and anger. They spring from the same source as those of the old Ascendancy Party in Ireland, in face of the gradual emancipation, religious, social and political, of the Catholics there. A down-trodden class is beginning to assert itself, to claim equality before the law, to call its traducers to book. The immunity the latter have enjoyed for centuries is no longer respected. The wicked beast is beginning to manifest its wickedness by resenting and replying to attack. Our adversary may calm his fears. The fact that Catholics can defend themselves to some extent in the Press, is due to the growing regard of the Fourth Estate, not particularly for the tenets of Rome, but for principles of honesty and fair-play. As the old No-Popery spirit weakens, these principles have more scope for exhibition. Let Mr. Chesterton in his down-right fashion explain the phenomenon which so puzzles and annoys Dr. Horton.

If it is true [he says]<sup>1</sup> that London editors and sub-editors are by this time somewhat shy of printing anti-Catholic scares, it is for the quite practical reason that they so often turn out to be untrue. The truth is quite the reverse of the present accusation. It is not that some fact is found against Catholicism, but is not published. It is that it is published and is then found not to be a fact. This has been the history of a hundred exposers of Romish evil, of the dirty half-wit "Maria Monk," of the fugitive profligate Achilli and numberless others. So when Dr. Horton says sternly to the practical sub-editor, "you have not had enough anti-Popery revelations in your paper," the practical sub-editor laughs and says, "thank you, we have had *quite* enough."

It is something to be thankful for that one journalist at least sees the humour and the true inwardness of the Hocking-cum-Horton libel on the English Press.

J. K.

<sup>1</sup> The *Daily News*, March 19.

**A Fleur de Lys and Two Godons.**

Most of us have been so impressed by the gentleness, purity, and saintliness of the character of Jeanne d'Arc, that one experiences something of a shock to learn that she commonly used the term *Godon* in speaking of her English adversaries. *Godon*, we are told on the highest authority, is a corruption of the words *God-damn*, and it is stated that as this oath was constantly on the lips of the English, it was popularly used by the French peasantry in the fifteenth century as a nickname. No doubt we are in any case justified in supposing that Jeanne had no conception of the meaning of the words she used, but there is a certain indignity about the association of any sort of rude profanity, however unconscious, with that most high-minded of God's servants, and we should all be glad to believe that the etymologists are for once in error. Some years ago we ventured in these pages to express a doubt as to the correctness of the derivation given,<sup>1</sup> and this doubt has only been intensified by such indications as we have met with in the interval. Perhaps the present may be an appropriate time for discussing the subject a little more fully.

Of the prevalence of the term *Godon* as a nickname for the English, and of its use by Jeanne herself, there can be no reasonable doubt. As for its prevalence, we have hardly troubled to go beyond the copious examples quoted in Godefroy's great *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne Langue française*, but the evidence is quite satisfactory. One point to be specially noted is that the word uniformly occurs in the form *Goddon* or *Godon*. There is no other termination more suggestive of its supposed English etymology. The earliest example given seems to belong to the beginning of the fifteenth century, in a French poem directed against the English,

Ne craignez point, allez battre  
les godons panches a poys.

(Fear not, go and fight these heavy-bellied godons.)

Another anti-English poem a century later speaks thus :

De trente mille de ces godons, gros veaux  
N'en retourna que six mille a Bourdeaux.

In which the descriptive epithet *gros veaux* (fat calves) again seems to draw attention to the physical characteristics of the

<sup>1</sup> See THE MONTH, Nov. 1902 : "The Adjective."

burly Englishmen. Similarly in a poem of 1513, we read of a maiden who was sold to the English :

A escumeurs de mer je suis baillée  
Et a godons, pourceaux remplis de biere.

(I am handed over to wreckers and to Godons, hogs brim-full of beer.)

It must be confessed that we find nothing of this in the examples connected with the *procès* of Jeanne d'Arc. She simply employs the word as a nickname. The first example occurs in the evidence of Aymond de Macy, who at the Rehabilitation trial declared that Jeanne had told the Earl of Stafford and others at Rouen that "if there were a hundred thousand godons more than there are now in France they should not keep the kingdom."<sup>1</sup> Again at the same inquiry<sup>2</sup> Colette, the wife of P. Milet, stated that when on one occasion a fine shad (fish) was offered to Jeanne for breakfast she would not stay to partake of it, but gaily told them that they must keep it until the evening when she would bring back "ung godon" with her as a prisoner who would help to eat it at supper. Lastly in an account of the expenses incurred at Orleans in 1439 over a dramatic representation of the Siege of the City and its Deliverance by the Maid, we have record of the sum paid to an artist for painting amongst other "properties" :

une fleur de liz et deux godons.

What the connection (if any) between the lily and the two godons may have been is not explained.

Now although such high authorities as Littré and the Oxford Dictionary seem to take the derivation of *godon* from *God-damn* for granted, it surely will be reasonable to ask for evidence that the oath in question was in common use among the Englishmen of that day. It is almost incredible that their French adversaries can have given a nickname to the whole body of invaders from a form of expression which was either wholly imaginary, or which, at the worst, was used only by one or two of their number. But, strange to say, there does not seem to be the least trace of any such oath to be found in pre-Reformation English literature. Numbers of satirists, poets, and composers of mystery plays wrote with great freedom. Chaucer and the authors of the metrical romances do not seem in the least afraid of shocking their readers by the vigour of the expletives which they introduce. But so far as the present

<sup>1</sup> Quicherat, *Procès*, vol. iii. p. 122.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 125.



writer has noticed, the combination "God damn" does not occur, at any rate not as an imprecation or ejaculation, in any English work older than the sixteenth century. Moreover, this personal impression is altogether borne out by the evidence of the Oxford Dictionary.<sup>1</sup> It seems impossible to suppose that a phrase common enough to be noticed by foreigners and converted into a nickname should have left no trace of itself in our written memorials. And yet it is not until the age of Shakespeare that the occurrence of the combination "God damn" is first recorded as an expletive, and then always, and for long after, in the form of "God-damn-me." The only example in Shakespeare is in the *Comedy of Errors*:<sup>2</sup>

Thereof comes that wenches say "God damn me."

But about 1640 the phrase in this form undoubtedly became very common. Contemporary literature, and more especially the drama, shows that it was a fashionable oath constantly on the lips of all the young bloods about town. Among the Puritans it became a sort of derisive epithet of the Cavaliers. A certain Sergeant Wharton in Cromwell's army has left us some very outspoken letters, written in 1642. The first Colonel under whom he served was a great deal too much of the Cavalier to suit the Sergeant's Puritan tastes. He describes him as "a Goddamme blade and doubtlesse hatcht in hell."<sup>3</sup>

So Samuel Butler, in *Hudibras*, writes:

The Solemn League and Covenant  
Will seem a mere God-damn-me rant.

It was an easy step from this to use the word as a sobriquet for any one addicted to swearing, and notably for the Cavaliers.

Thus, a writer in 1643, quoted in the Oxford Dictionary speaks with reprobation of the results of "long conversing with Goddammes." So Essex, in 1679, declares that "such words only befit a railing parson in his pulpit or a drunken Goddamme." Even in 1713, we read of others who "were of the town-cut young Goddammes, that spoke ill and lived worse." Now it is quite intelligible that under these conditions a young Englishman abroad who followed the prevailing mode might come to be called a *Goddam*; and this undoubtedly happened. The word is found in Beaumarchais and other smart writers

<sup>1</sup> See under the words *God damn* and *damn*.

<sup>2</sup> iv. 3, 54.

<sup>3</sup> *Archæologia*, xxxv. 313. Mr. Firth in quoting this in his book, *Cromwell's Army*, has copied it incorrectly as "Godamn" instead of "Goddamn me."

of the eighteenth century. It is duly recorded in Littré and the other dictionaries, and even down to the present day it is used as a vulgar nickname for an Englishman. But, be it noted, the word is always *God-dem* or *God-dam*, and no one, so far as I am aware, has pretended to quote any intermediate form or any nickname of this sort applied to an Englishman between the time when *Goddon* disappears from view in the first half of the sixteenth century, and the appearance of the word *Goddam*, which was to all seeming a perfectly new creation in the middle of the eighteenth. No doubt it is a very curious coincidence that these two nicknames if really independent of each other, should be so like in form, but stranger things have happened in the history of language and the data seem fairly clear.

But what, it may be asked, is the explanation and true etymology of the older word *goddon*? An interesting gleam of light is seemingly to be derived from an entry in the curious old French-English dictionary of Cotgrave of the beginning of the seventeenth century. The word *goddon* is duly included in the vocabulary with the following explanation: "*Goddon*, a filthie glutton or swiller; one that hath a vile wide swallow." In strict accord with this we find in the French section of Ducange's *Glossarium*, "*Godon*, gourmand, goulu," and the word *glotonus* is given as the Latin equivalent and derivation. Further, it seems certain that in the Spanish of the sixteenth century, as indeed at present, *gordon* meant a man with a fat paunch and with guzzling propensities. A reference, which I have been unable to verify satisfactorily, traces to a Spanish source this scrap of Latin: "*Erat unus grossus Godam qui nihil curabat nisi de ventre*," but the date of this is in any case very doubtful. Supposing that these forms represent the same word, the question arises whether this sense of guzzling is primitive or derivative. Were such persons called *goddons* because they were as voracious as Englishmen, or were Englishmen called *goddons* because they were presumably great drinkers and trenchermen? It seems impossible to arrive at any definite conclusion with the evidence before us. None the less, the failure to account for *goddon* satisfactorily does not imply that we are driven to accept the explanation that *goddon*=*God-damn*. It must be remembered that no mediæval writer is known to have proposed such an explanation. The suggestion dates from modern times and comes from those who, knowing that *God-dam* in the

eighteenth century was used abroad as a nickname for an Englishman, assumed that this must be identical with the *goddon* which denoted an Englishman three centuries earlier. But no continuity has been traced between *goddon* and *God-dam*, and there seems no conceivable reason why, if they were the same word, such continuity should not be traced.

On the other hand a good many possible explanations of *goddon* readily suggest themselves. From Shakespeare and modern dialectal forms we know that "good evening" was often pronounced as practically speaking one word—*godden*; just as *God-wot* (*i.e.* God knows) became one word—*goddot*. "Godden" (good evening) if heard frequently on English lips, might easily be mimicked by a Frenchman as *goddon*. Again it seems worth while to point out that there is a curious old French word which beyond all question does come from an English source. This is the substantive *godale* or *goudale*, which is simply the equivalent of "good ale." The derivation in this case is absolutely certain, for the word is of frequent occurrence, and the etymology is admitted by all authorities.<sup>1</sup> From the substantive *godale* we have further, a verb *godailier*, which means, to drink to excess. But besides this there seems to be a verb *goder*, which has much the same signification. Is it possible that *godon* may be formed from *goder*, and that it may have retained in this way some trace of its primitive connection with England?

H. T.

### True Continuity of Doctrine.

An instructive little controversy on the true meaning of "Continuity of Doctrine" is at present proceeding in the *Church Times*. It hardly seems to attract from our contemporary the attention it deserves, for, although on its decision depends the right of the Anglican Church to call itself the Church of Christ, it is given no particular prominence. One mark of that Church is that it should teach Christ's doctrine, and teach it consistently. If, then, any ecclesiastical organization can be shown

<sup>1</sup> This word, according to the quotations in Godefroy, goes back to 1301; for at that date we find entries of "*cervesie sive goudalle*." In Froissart (ii. 67) we meet "*Ales boire vostre goudale*." In Palsgrave's *Esclaircissement* (p. 760) we find these parallel sentences in English and French. "Toste me this bread, for a cuppe of ale and a toste is holsome in a morning for a man's sight." "Tostez moi ce pain car une coupe de goudalle a tout une tostée est bonne et saine au matyn pour la veue d'une personne."

to have taught authoritatively contradictory doctrines on the same subject at different stages of its history, its claim to be the Church of the Apostles is thereby invalidated. Either it was wrong in the first stage, and, therefore, did not start as Christ's Church, or it was wrong in the second, and, therefore, did not continue as Christ's Church. Now it is beyond dispute that, if at the Reformation the Church of England washed her face, she was somewhat too vigorous in the process, with the result that she washed her head off! In other words, previous to the Act of Royal Supremacy, that Church held as a dogma of faith the Supreme Headship of the Pope in spirituals, whereas afterwards she made the repudiation of that Supremacy one of her fundamental tenets. Here is a plain breach of continuity, destroying the identity of the latter Church with the former. Now, the Anglican argument runs—Admitting the above assertion for the moment, are not you Catholics in an exactly similar case? Previous to 1870, your Church taught that the Pope *per se* is not infallible; since 1870 she teaches, and under pain of heresy, that he is infallible; an open and palpable contradiction. How are you, then, better off in respect to continuity of doctrine than we Anglicans? The answer is very simple.

The Church has never, under pain of heresy *obliged* her children to believe at one time a doctrine which at another she *obliges* them under the same sanction to deny. Accordingly, although, before the definition of official Papal Infallibility in 1870, some of her pastors thought themselves free to teach the Gallican doctrine,<sup>1</sup> they never ventured to make it more than a mere theological opinion. Anyone of the faithful who wished to maintain, in face of that teaching, that the Pope was infallible within the recognized limits, apart from the consent of the Church, would have found the weight of authority on his side. In declaring in 1846,<sup>2</sup> that the personal infallibility of the Pope was "no article of the Catholic Faith," Keenan's Catechism meant that it had not in so many words been hitherto so defined. When it goes on to say—"No decision of his [the Pope's] can oblige under pain of heresy unless it be received and enforced by the teaching body—that is, by the Bishops of the Church"—it expresses what seemed a logical consequence of the previous

<sup>1</sup> See Keenan's *Controversial Catechism*, (First Edition, 1846, p. 117), published with episcopal sanction.

<sup>2</sup> The statement was removed from the third edition in 1853.

statement in the then state of theological knowledge. The authority of the *ecclesia docens* as a whole *was* universally recognized as commanding assent under pain of heresy, but not the sole authority of the Pope. So the Vatican Council in declaring the dogma in question to have been part of the original *depositum* (for that, of course, is what every definition of faith amounts to), did not mean to say that it had always been acknowledged to be such, but only that it was so objectively. The same is true in regard to the other great doctrinal decisions of the Church, *e.g.*, that concerning the Immaculate Conception in 1854, with this reservation. The Church has sometimes for the better repression of heresy, formally defined truths which on grounds of Scripture and Tradition were already taught and accepted as articles of faith. Thus, it would not be right to conclude from the above argument that until the definition of Nicæa in 325, anyone might without formal heresy have denied the Divinity of our Lord. In other words, what were actually explicit portions of the *depositum fidei* have been subjected to definition as well as what were till then only implicit and, in the latter instances, the degree of implicitness has constantly varied. However, the weight of authority and the *sensus communis fidelium* has always been on the side of the defined dogma, for the guiding Spirit of God is at work, not only at the moment of definition, but also in the long process of preparation for it.

J. K.

**Ven. Father da Silveira, S.J., and the Zimbabwe Ruins.**

The revival of interest in connection with the life and labours of Father da Silveira, the "Proto-Martyr of South Africa" as he is called, has raised many questions not immediately connected with the proof of genuine martyrdom required by the Sacred Congregation of Rites. From an historical point of view it is of great importance to know precisely where it was that the death of this holy missionary took place. Until recently the claims of the "Great Zimbabwe" to this honour have been admitted almost without question or dispute. And undoubtedly there are many circumstances which might seem to lend support to such a view. The "Great Zimbabwe" ruins, we would remind our readers, are situated some fifteen miles to the south-east of Victoria, in the southern half of Mashonaland. Controversy has raged for many years over the question of the origin and meaning and antiquity of those vast granite walls

and labyrinthine passages, which strike even the Kaffir mind with a sense of architectural incongruity. Mr. Theodore Bent suggested in 1892 that the ruins were of Arabian origin, part temple, part fortress, built at some remote period prior to the rise of Mohammedanism. And this view seems destined to prevail over the rival theory of Dr. Randall-MacIver,<sup>1</sup> which assigns a Bantu origin and a mere mediæval antiquity to these same ruins. Into questions of archæology, however, we need not enter. But it is of importance to note that the "Great Zimbabwe" is not the only ruin of its kind. All along the Sabi valley, on the Limpopo, in the Transvaal, Matabeleland, and elsewhere, there remain ruins of other Zimbabwes, of the same type and construction as the more important and vaster ruins near Victoria. What is the meaning of this generic term? In the Chiswina language of to-day, the word is pronounced as *dzimbawe* signifying the "grave of a chief." Its plural form is *madzimbawe*. These *madzimbawe* still exist to-day, the sepulchres of Paramount Chiefs, usually built up in stone amongst the rocks. Thus in the M'toko country is a *Dzimbawe* where the chief offers annual sacrifice to the spirits of his ancestors. A rival etymology would derive the word from *dzimba* (=houses) and *ibge* (=stone). But, were this the true derivation, *dzimbawe* would itself be a plural form, having as singular *imbawe*—a word which has no existence.

The association of the royal grave with the kraal of the Paramount Chief has added a further meaning to the term. Thus, in these as in olden days, *Zimbabwe* or *Dzimbawe* is used to denote the head kraal of a Paramount. The use of the word to designate the various stone ruins, of which the "Great Zimbabwe" is the most important, remains matter for conjecture. It may be that in some instances at least the deserted granite fortresses were temporarily used by the natives as their head kraals. Or perhaps, as is more probable, the kraal was established in close vicinity to the ruin, and the Paramount was laid to rest amongst the rocks on which the fortress had in former times been built.

In the time of the Portuguese activity in South-Eastern Africa, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the knowledge of the interior geography of the country was most indefinite and vague. And it seems clear that their references to the existence of these *madzimbawe* were derived by hearsay

<sup>1</sup> *Mediæval Rhodesia*, 1906.

from the Arabs, or the confused utterances of the Kaffirs themselves. Their chroniclers report that a mighty empire existed somewhere in the interior, westward of Sofala, under the imperial sway of the "Monomotapa." The seat of the "Golden Emperor," as they bombastically styled him, was naturally identified with the "Zimbabwe" of their informants. They mistook a general term for the name of a "city," the capital of the Monomotapa's empire. This Monomotapa, as we know now, was merely the Paramount Chief of a very numerous tribe, the Makaranga, which in those days inhabited a large part of the country between the Zambesi and Limpopo rivers. To-day they are confined to the Victoria District, and the country west of it, as far as the centre of Matabeleland. The word "Monomotapa" (or, more correctly, "Munomotapa") was the title of their Paramount, analogous to the "Czar" or "Kaiser" of modern Europe.

We ask, what has all this to do with Father da Silveira? The answer may be given at once. The reports of the missionary's death which were received at Goa stated that the martyrdom took place at the residence of the Monomotapa. Trusting to the chroniclers of the time, biographers have concluded that the death-scene occurred at Zimbabwe, the only residence of which they had any knowledge. And in more recent times this conclusion has seemed to be confirmed by the fact that the Makaranga of to-day inhabit the district around the "Great Zimbabwe," near Victoria. Furthermore, the river into which the body of Father da Silveira was cast is stated to be in the vicinity of Victoria. Are we then justified in assuming that the martyrdom of the missionary occurred at the "Great Zimbabwe"? We think that the answer must certainly be in the negative. In the first place, there is explicit mention in the earliest biography of Father da Silveira<sup>1</sup> that the Monomotapa's head-quarters were in the neighbourhood of Mount Fura. This mountain has been definitely identified with the present Mount Darwin, situated some 100 miles northward of Salisbury, and over 250 miles distant from the "Great Zimbabwe." Again, it is beyond doubt that the "Mosengesses" or "Motetes" (both names are given), the river into which the martyr's body was thrown, flows into the Zambesi. But all the rivers in the vicinity of the "Great Zimbabwe" take their course southwards, emptying themselves into the Sabi. In the Mount Darwin

<sup>1</sup> Godigno, *Vita P. Gonzali Sylveriae*, S. J. (Cologne, 1616), p. 107.



district, on the other hand, the Musengezi ("Mosengesses") flows northwards into the Zambesi, passing at a distance of some forty miles from Mount Fura. The alternative name of "Motetes" may be accounted for by the fact that the Musengezi changes its name nearer its source, being known as the Utete. Further exploration may reveal the fact that these in reality are two separate rivers. Yet their proximate locality is certain. These two objections, we think, are sufficient to disestablish the older claim of the "Great Zimbabwe" as the residence of the Monomotapa. Not that we wish to assert that *no* Monomotapa ever lived in its vicinity. The huts of the Kaffirs, as we know, are destroyed every seven or eight years, whenever dirt and the increase of vermin render their lodgings uninhabitable. The head kraal of the Paramount might easily have moved from place to place, though ever retaining its royal title of Zimbabwe. And for a similar reason the location of the Makaranga tribe near Victoria is no evidence that it was so situated in the sixteenth century. In fact we know that the Makaranga once extended themselves over the whole of Mashonaland. And the evidence we have given seems to lead irresistibly to the conclusion that, at least in the time of Father da Silveira, the Zimbabwe of the Monomotapa was situated on the Musengezi River, some sixty or seventy miles perhaps from Mount Fura, in Northern Mashonaland. H. C.

---

*Reviews.*

---

**I.—THE DAWN OF THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL IN ENGLAND, 1781—1803.<sup>1</sup>**

WHETHER we consider the subject treated in this history, or the method in which it has been handled, we feel that few books of the day will be so welcome as this to the Catholics of our country. Every one of us who has reached middle life, remembers to have seen, if he does not still see, some, perhaps many, relics of the penal days, some little chapel hidden in a mews or dwelling-house and obscured with galleries; some tiny chalices that could be hidden in a pocket, or some old priest who would not adopt the "Roman" collar. Mgr. Ward has undertaken to tell us the authentic history of our growth from

<sup>1</sup> By Monsignor Bernard Ward, President of St. Edmund's College. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 2 Vols. Pp. 370 and 316, with 38 Illustrations. Price, 25s. 1908.

the old state of depression to that emancipation which has brought us, except in a few details, the full rights of citizenship. It is impossible but that we should give him, and with pleasure, a full and attentive hearing.

His story begins with the time when the depression was at its worst; and the present instalment of it comes down to the second Emancipation Act and its consequences, that is, to the year 1803, when the Catholic community had received and adapted itself to a fairly ample share of liberty. The period abounds in adventures, changes, conflicts, victories and defeats. We pass in review the outbreak of the French Revolution, and the return to England of the long-exiled Colleges and Convents. We hear of the foundation of many Catholic institutions and religious houses, which are in vigorous life to-day. Less heroic, but most instructive chapters treat of "the Cisalpine Club and the Catholic Committee," of "the Protestation" and of "the Proposed Oath of 1789," of the Staffordshire Clergy and of Blanchardism. Lively times were those, full of furious controversies, and enlivened by much hard-hitting. The struggle was not about nothing. The liberties of the Church were at stake, and our worst enemies were well-intentioned but misdirected men of our own communion. Gallicanism, or Cisalpinism, as the prevalent error of those days was generally called, was prevalent among both clergy and laity, whose education had been so long carried on in France: and the Catholic gentry, whose courage and perseverance had been till now the chief bulwark of the Church, were imperceptibly falling into the way of considering the clergy, Bishops not excluded, as a collection of chaplains, more or less bound in decency to adopt the plans and politics of their patrons. From time to time Bishops and laity were in effect engaged in a struggle for the government of the Church; and it sometimes seemed as though their lordships might come off second best.

Certainly there is material here, which, if clumsily handled, might have caused a conflagration. But Mgr. Ward manages it admirably. Not only does he lead us, without a jarring word on his part, through quarrels, in which he must have been strongly tempted to take sides; he knows his matter so well that he can generally show us, in the words of the combatants themselves, how far they were in the right, and at what point they went wrong.

This is especially interesting in regard to the rivalry between Dr. Milner and Charles Butler. Father Amherst owned that

he was often unable to arrive at a conclusion as to the debates between them. Mgr. Ward is not only not at a loss, he is able to show, that many of his predecessor's judgments may and should be revised and lightened. His cautious moderation while writing about a thorough-going partizan like Milner is remarkable. It is as perilous to trust to Milner's strong statements about his opponents, as it is safe to rely on his unfailing instinct for choosing the right side. But many previous writers have missed the distinction, and have fallen into harsh judgments, which cannot be maintained.

Of Father Charles Plowden, the ex-Jesuit, something very similar may be said. He made fewer mistakes in the matter of orthodoxy than any other person here mentioned; for he stood almost alone in refusing to sign the "Protestation" of 1789. On the other hand, his vigour in belabouring his opponents was excessive, and he raised three adversaries for one whom he silenced. Of the other ex-Jesuits very little is said here. They were not restored even in Russia till 1801, and their chief difficulties are still to come.

Mgr. Ward's attention is centred, as we have said, on the Vicars Apostolic. No actors in that historical drama are more worthy of being studied than they; no one can speak for them more befittingly than the President of St. Edmund's; and no *apologia* could have been more felicitous than that which he has given us, whether we regard the whole argument of the two volumes, or such passages as that in which he vindicates them from the comparative neglect with which they have been treated by some enthusiasts for the restored Hierarchy. Again, the materials, from which the book has been constructed, having been mainly derived from the episcopal archives of the sees of Clifton and Westminster, it was only natural that the doings of the Bishops, especially those in the south and in the west, should come in for more notice than others.

But this has not been done without a certain loss of balance. The book might perhaps have been better described as a history of the English Vicars Apostolic during the Emancipation period, and if the subject had been thus circumscribed from the first, the history would have gained in conciseness and lucidity. It can hardly be said that the chapters treating of "Catholic England beyond the Seas," and "the Foundation of Colleges and Convents" (though they contain much valuable matter), throw upon the main course of the history a light proportioned to the space allotted to them. In such sections,

too, slips may be noticed, which are hard to discover elsewhere. With all deference to Mgr. Ward, the Carmelite Convent once at Hoogstraete, is now at Chichester; Father Plowden did not deny the existence of the Panzani Memoirs, and the fine house and estate of Burton Park was not bequeathed to the Jesuits, but the villa called Burton Hill, and that upon trust only.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, if the history given us in the "Introductory Chapter" seems sometimes weak and pointless, the explanation doubtless is that the period there handled lies furthest from that over which Mgr. Ward has a well-acknowledged mastery.

Another defect, not unworthy of comment in a scholarly work, which ought to be a work of reference for its period, is the defective bibliographical apparatus. There is no table of books used, and the charm of full titles is not appreciated. The enumeration of manuscript sources seems fairly complete, but with one important exception. No notice is taken of the archives of the Vatican and of the Propaganda, which would certainly not have been closed to Mgr. Ward, and in which he would have been sure to find many documents of first-rate importance.

But after all, the greatest of these deficiencies is but a trifle compared with the wealth of historical treasure which he has lavished upon us, and we conclude as we began by auguring a handsome sale for the author, and many hours of interest for his readers, who cannot possibly help being prepossessed in his favour by the long series of excellent illustrations.

## 2.—THE RHETORIC OF ARISTOTLE.<sup>2</sup>

In a well-known passage, having reference especially to this particular work, Cardinal Newman declared:<sup>3</sup>

While the world lasts, will Aristotle's doctrine on these matters last, for he is the oracle of nature and of truth. While we are men, we cannot help, to a great extent, being Aristotelians, for the great master does but analyze the thoughts, feelings, views, and opinions of human kind. He has told us the meaning of our own words and ideas, before we were born. In many subject-matters, to think correctly, is to think like Aristotle, and we are his disciples whether we will or no, though we may not know it.

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. pp. 51, 86; vol. ii. p. 45.

<sup>2</sup> A translation by Sir Richard Claverhouse Jebb, edited, with an Introduction and with supplementary notes, by John Edwin Sandys, Litt. D., &c. Cambridge, at the University Press. Pp. xxviii, 207. Price, 6s. net. 1909.

<sup>3</sup> *Idea of a University*, p. 109.

To those who recognize the truth of such an utterance nothing can be more opportune than the appearance of a translation of the Stagyræ's work, under the authority of two such scholars as those whose names appear on its title-page, for it will probably be acknowledged that, while no age ever stood more in need of a capacity for clear-thinking, this is not exactly the merit for which our own is most markedly conspicuous. The most profound and vital problems are discussed every day by all sorts and conditions of men, but how many of these have in any way trained themselves to discuss such matters with any profit? To them a study of the *Rhetoric* should be earnestly recommended.

Nothing, indeed, could be more unlike the common idea of Rhetoric than the precepts of this work. When an argument is styled "rhetorical," we usually understand that it is much sound and little sense, appealing to emotion rather than to reason, so that Plato denied that it had a better claim to rank as an art than Cookery. But this is totally contrary to Aristotle's doctrine, who starts his treatise by laying it down that "Rhetoric is the counterpart of Dialectic," or the art of argumentation, which Plato esteemed highly,—and the sum and substance of his doctrine is this, that the true rhetorician must thoroughly understand that of which he speaks, and be able to set the truth convincingly before his hearers. Other things may help, but this is the root of the matter. Rhetoric being defined as the faculty of discerning in every case the available means of persuasion, there are three directions in which such means may be found: (1) in the character of the speaker as exhibited in his speech, inducing his hearers to trust him (*πίστις ῥητορική*); (2) in the feelings excited in the hearers (*πίστις παθητική*); (3) in the proofs exhibited (*πίστις ἀποδεικτική*). These last, says Aristotle, form the only artistic element, all else being mere appendage. In particular, "it is a mistake to warp the judge by moving him to anger or envy or pity; it is as if a man who was going to use a rule should make it crooked." Hence, the master of Dialectic will be the true master of Rhetoric.

At the same time, it is obviously true that an art which confers the power of persuading, may be misused and employed to make the worse appear the better reason. But on the other hand, truth must of its own nature have the advantage over falsehood if the art placed at its service be equally excellent, and moreover, if there be those who by their skill in playing

upon the emotions may easily mislead the judgment of the hearers, who may be assumed to be usually a poor lot (*φᾶῦλοι οἱ ἄκροαταί*), all the more needful is it that the champion of right should be not less skilled in making an appeal to those same emotions, as he may legitimately do.

All this is totally unlike the general idea of Rhetoric and rhetoricians, and may, we hope, induce some of our readers to make themselves personally acquainted with a treatise of which we do but attempt to indicate the starting point.

### 3.—ITALY.<sup>1</sup>

In the General Preface to his Cambridge Historical Series, Mr. G. W. Prothero explains that the "series is intended for the use of persons anxious to understand the existing political conditions" of the various countries. The roots of these conditions lie in the past, in the historical causes which have operated during previous centuries. Of course there must be some time limit for such a series, and in these volumes it is fixed at the beginning of the sixteenth century. For Italy Mrs. H. M. Vernon brings her story up to the end of the eighteenth century, it being left to Mr. Stillman, in another volume of the series, to deal with the nineteenth century. The idea of such a series is excellent, but we cannot think that the volume before us fulfils its purpose. There is a danger in these compendious histories of extended periods. To write them properly almost requires that an author should have previously studied for and composed a really learned history of the same period on a large scale. Without such a previous training it is difficult for him to resist relying on a cursory inspection of the books consulted, and to fail in attaching due importance to the deep-laid causes which are much more influential in determining the course of subsequent events than those lying on the surface. Mrs. Vernon writes doubtless with the best intentions, but she fails seriously in this respect. She has no conception of the motives by which the actions of the Popes were determined, and is quite contented with the assumption that they were of a worldly and usually unworthy kind. The Popes were invariably set, she thinks, on self-glorification and purely temporal aims, and to attain them knew of no better method than by intrigue and hypocrisy. It never occurs to her that they may have had

<sup>1</sup> Cambridge Historical Series. Edited by G. W. Prothero, Litt D. Italy (1494—1790). By Mrs. H. M. Vernon (K. Dorothea Ewart). Cambridge University Press. Pp. viii. 516. Price, 5s. 6d. net. 1909.

deep religious convictions, or a deep sense of responsibility for the discharge of a very sacred trust, or that these causes may have had the dominant part in shaping their policy, even in cases where they were not exempt from foibles, not to speak of grave defects of character. Nor again has it occurred to her that there might have been, as there still is, a deep-rooted religious feeling and life in the mass of the Italian people, notwithstanding the evil lives which characterized a relatively small section of them but, being more conspicuous than the quiet lives of the rest, absorbs the attention of unwary observers. Had she read, to take a single instance even, such a book as Capececiatello's *Life of St. Charles Borromeo*, it might have given her some insight into the working and results of these spiritual causes, but her one idea of St. Charles is that he was a fanatical witch-hunter. Of the Counter-Reformation, to which she makes only superficial allusions, her idea is that it was a movement for the propagation of an external affectation of piety. "The character of the Popes themselves," she says, "conformed to the ideals of the Counter-Reformation; no one without a high reputation for piety and morality could hope to sit in Peter's chair, the only vice not excluded was hypocrisy." Or again, in a passage which is quite charming for its riot of imagination,

On the constructive side the Counter-Reformation was equally active. . . . The Oratory of S. Filippo Neri (founded 1575), who has been called the Apostle of Rome, had immense influence. It rendered fashionable a perfervid, emotional type of devotion, immortalized in pictures of fainting angels, and it performed those Cantatas, with ecstatic Libretti, set to music by Palestrina himself [Palestrina, of all composers] in which we find the origin of the modern Oratorio. Meanwhile the Jesuits had taken possession of the greater part of lay education. The boys trained in their schools were well disciplined, and had plenty of classical drill; they were also devout Churchmen, taught to surrender their consciences, and to find their spiritual life in the sentimental devotions of the Oratory.

With this misapprehension of general method errors of detail were inevitable. We have noted down a good many, of which the following are a few instances. Thus, on p. 78, we are told that the Popes of the sixteenth century did not want a General Council, fearing lest it should attempt to reform the Curia, but, relying on the large number of their creatures in the Italian episcopate who would be able to swamp a Council, they took heart of grace, and

the weight of this solid force of resistance, and the skilful manipulation of political intrigue, enabled the Popes, Paul III. and Julius III.,



to thwart the original purpose for which the Council was called, and to convert it instead into an orthodox body whose chief work was to fix in definite form parts of the dogmatic system of the Church which had hitherto been hazy and undefined.

This is hopeless confusion. The Popes feared, and rightly, lest in the disturbed state of minds attempts might be made to renew the scandal of the Basle schism, but apart from that they were anxious for a General Council, and made several attempts to bring it together, only they were deterred by the dissensions between France and the Empire, and the fear of Turkish invasion. Of course, they meant it to be the meeting of an orthodox body, nor could they have tolerated one in which the heretics had voting powers. Of course, one object was to define the Church's dogmas and oppose them to the heresies of the day, but there was also the object of taking measures for the reform of morals and discipline. To say of Paul III. that he "sacrificed Italy and the Church to the fortunes of his bastard family," is a simple calumny. In his early and pre-clerical life he was not altogether immaculate. He was then married, but had also an illegitimate offspring, nor during his Pontificate did he show the unworldliness of Popes like St. Pius V., Sixtus V., or Clement VIII. He yielded to the prevailing practice of nepotism, and many of his relatives whom he promoted did him small credit, though his grandson, Alessandro Farnese, was renowned for his virtues and generosity. But Paul III. was a true, zealous and single-minded worker in the field of Church reform, and was, in fact, the Pope who inaugurated the Counter-Reformation. It is another exploded calumny that Gregory XIII. rejoiced over the *massacre* of St. Bartholomew; he rejoiced only in the first instance, when he was told by the King's messengers that the Huguenots had been lawfully defeated in battle. She says of Pius VI. that when Ferdinand of Naples refused to pay money as tribute for the kingdom of Naples, but would pay it as a devout offering, Pius was offended because "his vanity delighted in the picturesque ceremony of the presentation of a palfrey which accompanied the homage." That of Pius VI., with all his integrity and high principle, is really too absurd, but it does not seem to strike the authoress that personal characters need to be taken into account in historical writing. Or indeed the character of points in dispute. From her account of Pius VI.'s quarrel with Duke Leopold of Tuscany over the latter's projected "reforms," the reforms in introducing which

Bishop Ricci of Pistoja was his chief instrument, it is impossible to think that she understands what was at stake; any more than she does in regard to the dispute between the Jesuits and Jansenists which led to the Bull *Unigenitus*, of which she says that it "uncompromisingly asserted Jesuit theology, thus unwisely alienating the learned Catholics who followed Augustine and Aquinas." That St. Philip Neri was made a Cardinal, or that Reginald Pole "was summoned from England and examined" (apparently at Rome), are curious though more venial mistakes, still an English writer should know that Pole never left England after he took up the Archbishopric of Canterbury. These instances, out of many we have noted down, suffice to show that this volume, in spite of the pains the writer has very likely taken over it, cannot be deemed satisfactory.

---

#### 4.—THE CREED IN THE EPISTLES.<sup>1</sup>

How is it that the Epistles contain so few of the facts of our Lord's life as recorded in the Gospels, and on the other hand why is there so little in the Gospels about the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in those who live by faith, although this is *the* characteristic of the religion of the Epistles? Does not this imply that, if we take the Gospel account as primitive, we must hold that St. Paul introduced elements foreign to it and allowed these to supersede the genuine version of our Lord's Teaching? Or, if we take St. Paul's account as primitive, must we not gather that the Gospel version was wrong alike in its wealth of facts which must then be set down to the working of pious imaginations, and in its account of our Lord's Teaching which it entirely misconceived? In approaching this difficulty Mr. Richmond justly points out that, as the Synoptic Gospels were written after the first chronological group of St. Paul's Epistles, and St. John's much later, they must have been composed by writers fully aware of St. Paul's teaching, which by the time when they were composing their Gospels had become the general and familiar belief of the Church. In giving, therefore, to their own writings the characteristics, negative and positive, which we find in them, they must have acted designedly. They wrote down what they had witnessed themselves, or had learnt from others who were eye-witnesses, but were not

<sup>1</sup> *The Creed in the Epistles. A Survey of the Creed of the First Age of the Church, as exhibited in the early Epistles of St. Paul.* By W. Richmond. London: Methuen and Co. Pp. xviii, 114. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1909.

conscious of any discrepancy between their facts and the Apostolic teaching. Thus the discrepancy we seem to find must be apparent only, and the author indicates convincingly, as it seems to us, how it can be explained. Our Lord's teaching was preparatory, at least in regard to the general body of His hearers. With His Apostles He went further, and we learn from St. John that, in the final discourses particularly, He spoke of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, as of a dispensation yet to come when He Himself had passed to Heaven—of a dispensation in which the Holy Spirit would come down to take up and continue Christ's own work, by dwelling in the Church and its members, bringing back His teaching to their minds, transforming and strengthening their hearts. It was with the manifestation and fruits of this indwelling that the preaching of Apostles like St. Paul was in due sequence chiefly concerned. On the other hand, if we do not find the same fulness in St. Paul's references to our Lord's deeds and words as in the Gospels, at least he is solicitous for an historical foundation to his preaching and finds it in the primary facts recorded in the Gospels. The author in the book before us illustrates this truth, taking the articles of the Creed for his basis, and setting against each the passages from the four Epistles of the earliest group which affirm it. It was a useful idea, for it enables a reader to appreciate the importance which St. Paul attaches to an historical foundation.

#### 5.—ECCLESIA DISCENS.<sup>1</sup>

The Rev. H. F. Peile, the author of *Ecclesia discens*, is the Bampton Lecturer of 1907, whose lectures on the *Reproach of the Gospel* attracted a good deal of attention at the time. The sermons and essays in this volume, though belonging to different times and places, are connected by a common thought which animates them, and is indicated by the title *Ecclesia discens*. Ordinarily, one understands by the *Ecclesia discens* the taught as distinguished from the teaching section of the Church, the flock as distinguished from the Bishops. Here we are to understand by it "the Church which somehow seems to have lost the right to teach the world, and now has to learn from it, if nothing else, at least how it is to become its teacher again." Time, with its intellectual and social revolutions, is winnowing out roughly the temporal from the eternal, and the problem for modern

<sup>1</sup> The Church's Lesson from the Age. By the Rev. H. F. Peile, M.A. London: Longmans. Pp. viii, 303. Price, 5s. net. 1909.

believers is to "discern where truth and life lie in adaptation to environment, and where they lie in resistance to environment." So the author conceives of the present situation, and his endeavour is to minister to the furtherance of this discernment.

The book is a pathetic book, there is no other adjective for it. It is that of a good man towards whose distresses one's heart goes out, one who grieves over the spiritual darkness which, as it seems to him, is settling down on the world, and peers around with a clinging hope for some possible ray of light to guide man's onward way and lift up his spirit. He looks back on the past periods of Christian history in a sermon on the Epiphany. That "light to lighten the Gentiles" meant so much and wrought so much in transforming a sinful and despondent world—"does it still guide our feet in the way that leads us where we shall find our Saviour Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and the Son of Man? Or has the light grown dim? Can it be that the faith of Christ lies dying to-day as the faith of the old gods died twenty centuries ago?" Of one thing he is convinced; loyalty to truth must be a first principle with us; and hence there must be no intrusion of authority into the realm of scientific and critical research. Whatever be the verdict of these rational methods, it must be accepted without resistance. It is clear, too, that it is making havoc of our old beliefs, and leaving us only a residue at the thought of which our forefathers would have been aghast. Will it not, at least, leave us the essentials of our Christian faith and hope, those essentials of historical fact without which the life-giving power of the Old Gospel cannot survive—"the Life and Teaching of Jesus of Nazareth"?

Here is the distress which the author states very powerfully; but it is doubtful if he himself would claim that his remedies give him real satisfaction. He looks to Modernism appealingly and yet distrustfully. Does not its large sanction of subjectivism forebode a disastrous outburst of extravagant Individualism? On the other hand, may there not be something in its doctrine of religious experience, something that will avail to preserve for us at least that basis of historical fact which we simply cannot resign ourselves to surrendering? He has not really grasped what Modernism is, especially he has not grasped its distinction between the historical Christ and the Christ-ideal. When he does he will find that it does unquestionably "rob mankind of the *historical* and personal Christ, God the Son Incarnate as Jesus of Nazareth." But may we suggest to him to pay more attention to the philosophical presuppositions of

Modernism, and reflect whether, these apart, the application of sound critical principles to the Gospels and earlier Christian documents leads to such destructive results; or whether, if we do not antecedently exclude the possibility of an Incarnate God, of a supernatural order, or of miracles, these documents do not yield to the most searching inquisition the main facts (we will not here claim more than this) which Christendom has hitherto treated as historical, and as furnishing it with its credentials? It is this feeling at all events, and not any insensibility to the rights of truth, which in the Catholic Church causes her pastors and theologians to retain their time-honoured belief in the full contents of the Gospel-story—not this only, for she has other and sufficient proofs in her own superhuman origin and history, but this inclusively.

The sermons in this volume are in two parts, one on Belief, the other on Practice. Our criticisms have referred to the former part only. The latter have much that is well worth reading and weighing. But the same saddening *leit-motiv* is heard throughout, particularly in the two papers on the *Religio Pueri* and that on *Universities*.

## 6.—IMMORTALITY.<sup>1</sup>

Canon Holmes treats of Immortality under various headings, such as Immortality and Pre-existence, Immortality and Instinct, Prayers for the Dead, the Shortness of Life, Immortality and Death, Immortality and Hell. One looks in the first instance for some proofs of Immortality, and one cannot help feeling that those contained in the four chapters he more directly devotes to that subject are inconclusive. That man's heart revolts against the thought of Annihilation and Absorption, or that both his personal and his social instinct impel him to desire a future life which he can share with his friends, is most true, and is an important element in the argument for Immortality. But it does not conclude unless the existence and principal attributes of God have first been established; for, apart from these, why must man's desires, however imperative, count on being satisfied? Yet the author does not set his argument on that foundation. The only argument which of itself concludes is, we believe, the argument from the spiritual nature of the human soul. Death is the dissolution of con-

<sup>1</sup> By E. E. Holmes. Oxford Library of Practical Theology. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Pp. xii, 320. Price, 5s. 1909.

stituent elements, but in a spiritual soul there is nothing to dissolve. It would have been better then to include this argument, even though it could be pleaded with some justice that the volumes of this Oxford Library are meant, not for theologians or students, but for ordinary readers, who are often moved by arguments in themselves less conclusive but more concrete. In any case, it would surely have been better to omit the argument from the phenomena of supposed Spirit apparitions, which are not nearly sufficiently established.

In the later chapters Canon Holmes has a number of good things to say, which he supports with many happy quotations—a characteristic indeed of his style of treatment throughout the book. Some chapters—as those on the Pain of Paradise, the Sin of Sadness, Immortality and Love, Immortality in Heaven—we particularly like. In that on Immortality and Hell, he fails to estimate the full force of our Lord's teaching. More than once he repeats that "Holy Scripture nowhere reveals what that punishment [in Hell] is." But our Lord does distinctly say that it will be "everlasting fire." We may speculate, if we like, whether this phrase is to be taken literally or only metaphorically but, even if we take it metaphorically, we have to face the fact that it is this fearful metaphor which our merciful Lord chose as best adapted to prove to us the severity of the reality.

It is a pity that Canon Holmes should in one place have gone quite out of his way to repeat one of the late Lord Acton's rash accusations against the Catholic Church. "Lord Acton," he says, "the great Roman Catholic historian, writes in a letter to the *Times* dated November 8, 1874, that a Pope, famous as the author of the first crusade, decided that it is no murder to kill excommunicated persons." Lord Acton was never to be trusted in these "shockers" he was so fond of bringing out of the stores of his undigested erudition, and had Canon Holmes thought of inquiring, he would have found from the *Tablet* for December 12 of that year, how far in this instance Lord Acton's references fell short of supporting him in his monstrous accusations. Father Mumford's quaint mathematical computation of the likely number of a good man's smaller sins was fairer game for him. Still, it is doubtful whether he sees precisely the point Father Mumford wished to illustrate.

### 7.—THE REPORT OF THE EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS.<sup>1</sup>

The long-delayed and eagerly-expected Report of the great religious gathering which met at Westminster last September has come to hand at last, and our first hasty impression—one which detailed examination only intensifies—is that it was well worth waiting for. The book is a large one, well got up and tastefully bound, and, whether we consider the description of the various meetings and incidents, or the collection, singularly complete, of the valuable papers read, it is a worthy memorial of a unique occasion. It will serve, as it is perused at leisure, to deepen and increase the good effects of the Congress itself. Even the most ardent Congressist could have been present at only a few of the many constituent gatherings, and must needs have missed several of the various stately ceremonies that marked its progress. In reading these pages, the effect comes on one as a whole, with the result that one has no difficulty in believing that the Nineteenth Eucharistic Congress, which not a few thought foredoomed to failure, was far and away the most successful of the entire series. We may fairly suppose from the terms of the letter addressed, after receiving the Report of his Legate, by Pope Pius to our Archbishop, to which the Editor rightly calls attention in his Preface, that such was the impression made upon His Holiness himself.

In these vivid pages, wherein the whole series of events is treated chronologically from the arrival to the departure of the Legate, no significant detail is omitted, and everything appears in its due setting and proportion. To say a word—unfortunately want of space allows little more—about the various papers read at the sectional meetings, it has been remarked that, whereas at other Congresses, properly enough, greater stress was laid upon the devotional and practical aspect of the subject, in this many contributions of permanent value were made to the history and literature of the Eucharist. We may mention the French papers read on the morning and afternoon of the Friday by various Benedictine and Jesuit Fathers, particularly the communication of a most important liturgical document by Dom Pierre de Puniet, which throws remarkable light on the

<sup>1</sup> Report of the Nineteenth Eucharistic Congress, held at Westminster from 9th to 13th of September, 1908. London: Sands and Co. Pp. xxiii, 684, 14 full-page illustrations. Price, 5s. net. 1909.



"epiklesis" question, the very thorough historical study on "The Mass and the Reformation" by Mgr. Canon Moyes, and Viscount Llandaff's pronouncement on the Royal Declaration, of which much more is likely to be heard in the near future. The whole collection, whether historical or devotional, (and we must not be thought to undervalue the latter), forms a body of Eucharistic doctrine which, were it the only fruit of the Congress, would have justified the energy expended in bringing the meeting about.

In the narrative portions of the volume free use has been made of the really picturesque descriptions, wherein literary skill was combined with knowledge, which filled the columns of our Catholic papers, notably *The Tablet*, *The Catholic Times* and *The Universe*, during the progress of the gathering. Many people will turn to the account of the Sunday's Procession and will read once more, with renewed admiration of the statesman-like conduct of the Archbishop, the correspondence with the responsible Ministers of State that preceded it and determined its final character. In this connection there is a most useful collection of Press comments on the affair printed in an Appendix which shows that the commonsense of the nation as represented by the chief newspapers was wholly on the side of the Catholics. Other Appendices are devoted to chronicling the names of dignitaries who attended, officials who organized proceedings and other useful historical matters. A special discussion of the legality of the Procession as originally proposed makes it clear, against the assertion of the ultra-Protestants, that the law on the matter, to say the least, is highly ambiguous.

We cannot dwell any longer on a most interesting and valuable book which we trust will be largely read by Catholics. The labour expended in bringing it out so admirably has clearly been very great, and we regret that the modesty of the editor has prevented his name from being associated with his work. And whilst it makes for edification amongst the faithful, we may venture to hope that its calm perusal, now that angry feelings have to a large extent subsided, will bring home to our separated brethren that the Church had nothing in view but the glory of God in this great gathering, that her action was in no sense boastful or aggressive, and that, while longing for their return to her fold, she relied on no other arguments than those addressed to reason, no other weapons than earnest prayer.

**8.—LONDON GILDS AND LIVERY COMPANIES.<sup>1</sup>**

There is so much that is interesting and valuable in Mr. George Unwin's recent contribution to the series of "the Antiquary's Books," that it would be ungracious to complain too insistently that he has not given us an essay of somewhat wider scope. No doubt the London gilds do in many ways occupy a place apart and require separate treatment, but one is tempted to think that in such a collection of handbooks a general treatise on English gilds with a longer bibliography would have been more useful to the average student who is often interested primarily in the history and antiquities of his own country district. But taking Mr. Unwin's book as it comes to us, we find it a very admirable piece of work, clearing up many points of difficulty and bringing us in his introductory chapters into relation with Continental analogies which are undoubtedly too often neglected by English inquirers in all fields of mediæval research. Strange and inexplicable as it may seem, we must never lose sight of the fact that Western Christendom in the Middle Ages was much more cosmopolitan than we now have any idea of. The influence of the Church was one conspicuous cause, the Religious Orders constituted another, the University system a third, the prevalence of Latin as the language of literature and learning was a fourth; and now we may learn from Mr. Unwin, if we have not learnt it long ago from Professor Otto Gierke, that the commercial procedure and mercantile relations of the different countries formed another great bond of union, and that the associations connected with this important department of mediæval life were assimilated to a degree we should not antecedently have believed to be possible.

Once we have reconciled ourselves to the limited scope of his book, Mr. Unwin seems to us to have shown much discrimination in the manner in which he has dealt with his subject. As a study of the headings of his chapters would alone suffice to show, he has neglected neither the more vital nor the more trivial aspects of Gild life. His sections on "The Adulterine Gilds," "The Crafts and the Institutions," "The Rule of the Mистерies, 1376-84," and the "Greater and Lesser Mистерies" seem to us to throw a flood of light on a very difficult period of history. On the other hand, less weighty matters such as the Lord Mayor's Show and other pageants, the halls of the

<sup>1</sup> *The Gilds and Companies of London.* By George Unwin. Pp. xvi, 396. London: Methuen. Price, 7s. 6d. 1909.

companies with their liveries and feasts, as well as their palls and other antiquities, are not neglected. Moreover, the value of this section of the work is very much enhanced by good and plentiful illustrations. Neither have the religious aspects of the subject been entirely passed over, although we should often have been glad of more information than Mr. Unwin has found room to give us. But in any case there is plenty of matter in the volume to interest the student of ecclesiastical antiquities. For example, the "gilds of the bridge" mentioned in the Pipe Roll of 1179—1180 offer a valuable side-light upon the associations of bridge-builders, which are commonly held to have originated with the work of the almost contemporary St. Bénézet of Avignon. So, again, it is pleasant to read how the Pinners from their slender income, "provided half a dozen trentals of Masses, at 2s. 6d. the trental, for the souls of deceased members, paid the waxchandler, fee'd the sexton of Elsing Spital, and bestowed six hundred pins on the Sisters of St. James' Hospital to secure their prayers." We are not quite satisfied with Mr. Unwin's explanation of that obscure subject, Our Lady of the Puy, and we are surprised to find no mention anywhere of the paternosterers, though they must surely have had some sort of organization in London. We cannot, indeed, be quite certain that Mr. Unwin says nothing about them. The absence of the word paternosterer from the Index is not an infallible indication, for the Index, it must be confessed, has not been made with much discrimination.

---

### Short Notices.

---

THE *Etude sur les Assurances-Vie*, by Father Schul, S.J., is a work to be recommended as a good exposition in an elementary way of the calculation of Life Assurance Premiums. The arrangement is neat and compact, and the Appendix giving the formulæ ought to prove useful. The graphic representation is a good idea. A few minor criticisms, however, might be made. It seems to us that a little longer explanation of a Table of Mortality than that given by the author is desirable, as this is the whole basis of what follows. Further, a short description of the practical construction of a Mortality Table might have been given with advantage. In the section on Probability, the wording of some of the examples seems hardly precise enough, and exception might be taken to some of the symbols employed. For instance, in the second example it would seem to be more in accordance with the international notation if a bar were placed over the  $x$  y, thus denoting that the survivorship of the lives is in question, and not the joint lives. We also think that some of the formulæ in Chap. III. would be less involved if  $d$  (interest in advance for one year on  $l$ ) had been introduced ( $d=1-v$ ).

The treatise *Caisse de Pension à Rente Variable*, by the same author, is of a more advanced character, and deals with the case of a pension increasing with the age of a pensioner. The idea is somewhat novel, at any rate so far as Pension Funds in England are concerned. The main problem is first of all attacked theoretically, and variations are discussed: examples are then afforded of the working. Some excellent notes are given with regard to the limitation of the ultimate amount of the pension. As an exercise of a special type in connection with Pension Funds, the book can be recommended for the use of students.

Father Vaughan's address on Socialism, entitled *Socialism: is it Liberty or Tyranny?* (Allen, 6d. net.), does not aim at being an exhaustive treatment of the subject, but a popular exposition of it from the point of view of Christian common-sense. Taking Socialism in its wider sense, as including not merely the economic but the political, social and religious changes advocated by its most authoritative advocates, he has little difficulty in showing that a theory of life which starts from false principles and omits essential considerations, will inevitably result in confusion and anarchy. At the same time, the author is not an advocate of *laissez faire*: he is conscious, as all devoted workers amongst the poor must be, of the enormous abuses of our modern commercial civilization, and is keen to apply to them the only real remedies, the principles of Christianity—the recognition on the part of both Capital and Labour of another world than this, and of their responsibility to a Supreme Judge for their use of wealth and energy. The Christian ideal of a perfect modern society is one which needs effective presentment to our age, and perhaps Father Vaughan may find time, as he has the ability, to set it forth.

*Little Angels: a Book of Comfort for Mourning Mothers* (Burns and Oates, 2s. 6d. net.), is a work which only the tender heart and skilled literary hand of the Editor of the *Irish Monthly* could have composed. It is not easy to describe it shortly. Father Russell has wandered through the highways and byways of literature—the latter by preference—and culled whatever blossoms he could find, mainly poetical, that had reference to children and their early deaths. These he has united in a pious prose commentary, full of the treasures of a well-stocked and observant mind, so that not only those for whom the book is designed may read it with profit and delight, but those also who love literature and childhood.

Messrs. Constable and Co. have added to their useful shilling series of *Philosophies Ancient and Modern*, monographs on *Plato*, by A. E. Taylor, and on *Berkeley and Spiritual Realism*, by A. C. Fraser. Neither of these critics has been at pains to indicate his own philosophical standpoint, so as to let us know their standard of judgment. But the characteristics of Plato's thought are ably analyzed and presented in very readable form by Mr. Taylor, and the fantastic system of Bishop Berkeley, whose only reality was spirit, and who, therefore, was compelled to set down all sensible experience, including that of our own bodies, to the immediate action of God, receives clear and careful treatment at the hands of the veteran Edinburgh professor.

In *Dangers of the Day* (Ave Maria Press: \$1.00), Mgr. John Vaughan has written eight simple yet stirring discourses on as many occasions of moral obliquity especially prominent in our times, although always part-material of the Christian's warfare. They may be summed up in the three concupiscences—a familiar theme, but one treated here with a freshness and appositeness of illustration that make it come home. A capital book for spiritual reading.

Many of the incidents and excitements of the Eucharistic Congress are recalled by M. le Chanoine A. Morigny's *Une Semaine à Londres* (Vitte : 3.50 fr). But the main interest of the book lies in the curious spectacle presented by our familiar scenes and institutions when thus viewed in something of a hurry by a man brought up in such a different atmosphere. The Canon is always vivid in style and interesting in his reflections, even when they are based, as they not unseldom are, upon incomplete information.

The fate that sometimes befalls parents who educate their children for this world exclusively, and let the next take care of itself, is described effectively by Miss Frances Noble in a story entitled *Not For this World Only* (Sands, 2s. 6d. net.). A shorter tale with an equally striking moral is included in the volume.

**Phases of the Sacred Passion** (Wagner : New York 40 cents), by the Rev. William Graham, is a series of six sermons described as a Lenten course which would make especially appropriate reading for Holy Week. Another Lenten book, the use of which is intended to occupy the whole season, is a C.T.S. publication, *In Memory of Christ's Passion*, or *Daily Communion during Lent* (6d. net.), a number of reflections arranged by way of preparation and thanksgiving for each day. In the same connection, we may mention another little book by Father de Zulueta, S.J., entitled *Frequent and Daily Communion even for Men* (Sands, 1d.), and devoted to showing that women and children have no monopoly of the Holy Father's solicitude in the matter of more frequent approach to the Holy Table.

Having shown, as far as precept can show, the Sunday-School Teacher how to succeed, the Rev. P. J. Sloan in *The Sunday-School Director's Guide to Success* (Benziger, 4s. net), performs the same useful function for the Rector of the parish. The above qualification is applicable here too. Where the problems are so various and so individual, even the best instructor must confine himself to generalities. Precept and practice must combine to ensure a good result. A good deal, however, about organization can be learned from these pages, and the director will take no harm from being reminded of the qualities necessary both for efficiency and for perfection. Nothing that can instruct and stimulate him appears to be omitted.

We are not told that *Forgive and Forget*, by Ernst Lingen (Benziger, 5s.), is a translation from the German, but a certain stiffness about the English style suggests a foreign author. However, it is not so marked as to detract from the interest of the story, which concerns the complications arising from three young men falling in love with the same girl. The knot could not be unloosed without killing the best of them, but the ending is not a sad one.

We characterized Father Ferreres' Spanish commentary on the epoch-making decree of Pope Pius X. concerning the reception of the Holy Eucharist as the fullest and most thorough we had yet seen. That praise is still its due now that it appears in an English dress, translated by Father Jimenez, S.J., and entitled, *The Decree on Daily Communion : an Historical Sketch and Commentary* (Sands and Co., 2s. 6d. net). The historical sketch is of the greatest value, worthy of being ranked with Father Dalgairns' famous Introduction to his book on Holy Communion. The author, by a lengthy citation of authorities, shows clearly what a change is involved in this new departure in Church discipline, and consequently how careful pastors and directors of souls should be to get thoroughly in harmony with the Church's mind in the matter. There is no book better adapted to enable them to do this than the pious and scholarly treatise of Father Ferreres. The translation is very well done, and shows few traces of the idiom of the original.

The volumes which Messrs. Bloud of Paris issue in the series, *La Pensée Chrétienne : Textes et Etudes*, are always welcome as valuable additions to Christian literature. The latest, **Leibnitz**, by M. Jean Baruzi (5 fr.) has a special importance on account of the number of hitherto unknown MSS. of the great philosopher which have been discovered in the royal library of Hanover during recent years. In a long and carefully-written Introduction forming about one-third of the volume M. Baruzi has pointed out the significance of these new documents for our estimation of Leibnitz, and he has printed a number of them with explanatory comments in the collection of extracts exhibiting the mind of the author, which occupy the bulk of the treatise.

Under the rather long title—**The Path which led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church**, by Peter H. Burnett, Mr. Herder has reprinted a well-known apologetic work which first saw the light fifty years ago. Father Sullivan, S.J., the editor of this re-issue, explains that the book has been reduced to about half its original length, and thereby rendered more forcible and easy to follow, by the omission of long quotations and subsidiary arguments and the excision of repetitions. In its new shape it should rival its old success, for it is an excellent specimen of how a sincere mind, trained to weigh and appreciate evidence, was led to accept the credentials of the Catholic Church, such as they lie open to the honest investigation of all educated men.

Few of our readers, probably, know much about the life of the Foundress of the Order of St. Joseph of Cluny, the process of whose beatification is, nevertheless, now in progress. Canon V. Caillard, of Tours, in **La Vénérable Anne-Marie Javouhey** (Gabalda, 2 fr.), gives them the means of removing their ignorance. The holy Religious died in 1851, so she is a saint of our own time. In sketching her career and exploits, the Canon has shown how much she had to suffer from ecclesiastical persons of eminence, whose actions, as historian, he frankly sets forth, whilst leaving their final appreciation to the omniscient Judge.

Dr. Sebastian Reinstadler's **Elementa Philosophiae Scholasticae** (Herder, 2 vols., 7.50 fr.), first appeared in 1901, and now, eight years later, has reached a fourth edition, a testimony of no slight weight to its value as an exposition of Scholastic Philosophy. It is one of those treatises which owed its inspiration to the appeal made by Leo XIII. for the fearless application of the philosophical principles of St. Thomas to modern problems, and, though necessarily concise in its treatment, it is thoroughly up-to-date in the best sense. Besides its usefulness to the student, its brevity and lucidity should make it an excellent means for a busy priest to renew acquaintance with the philosophy of the Church.

St. Augustine somewhere says that the Jews were the pedagogues of the Christians, teaching them to read the book of the word of God, though they did not themselves understand its message. Mgr. Marini, in **L'Immacolata Concezione di Maria Vergine et la Chiesa Greca Ortodossa dissidente** (Rome, Salviucci), shows us something similar in regard to the Greek Church. Though the official Church of to-day denies the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, the Greek Fathers have written many noble passages on the perfect stainlessness of Mary. These passages are here cited in full, and discussed with a clearness and force which we cannot but praise and admire. Many of our readers may be glad to procure this little book from Rome betimes. They will find in it a number of fresh, scholarly, and poetic thoughts suitable for the month of May.

Of the two new pamphlets in the C.T.S. *History of Religions Series*, one



—**The Religion of the Athenian Philosophers**, by Rev. Henry Browne, S.J.—concerns a defunct creed, and the other—**The Religion of Unitarianism**, by G. S. Hitchcock, B.A.—a creed which, if not in any sense moribund, has never had a very vigorous existence. Father Browne wisely confines himself to the master-minds of the old Greek religion—Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle—and draws out clearly their attitude towards the pagan cults around them, whilst indicating the amount of truth their lofty speculations attained. As regards Unitarianism, we fancy that most readers will be surprised at Mr. Hitchcock's revelation of the extreme tenuity of that creed, which is based merely on natural reason. His analysis is thorough and illuminating.

Father Raymond Génier, O.P., of Jerusalem, has made his *Vie de Saint Euthyme le Grand* (377—473) (Gabalda, 4 fr.) the vehicle of much information about monastic life in Palestine in the fifth century. The volume is in fact the first of a series of *Études palestiniennes et orientales* which is being edited by the well-known Père Lagrange, O.P. The author's vivid and interesting narrative has brought to life again the figures which dwelt in these far-off times and remote spaces, and his pictures of these early developments of Christianity are full of instruction. Pictures of another sort, taken from excellent photographs, show us some of the scenes of St. Euthymius' activity.

M. l'Abbé F. Mourret has given us a very thorough and well-considered piece of work in his *Leçons sur l'Art de Prêcher* (Bloud, 5 fr.). It is in the form of letters to a young curate, and falls into two natural divisions—What, and How, one ought to preach. In the first part, the attitude of the modern preacher towards Scripture questions, the treatment of dogma, of controversy, of social concerns, the legends and lives of the Saints, the practices of asceticism and of mysticism, is discussed in a straightforward and sensible style. The practical part goes into great detail as regards psychological and physiological conditions, the cultivation of the voice, the art of gesticulation, &c. Several useful Appendices give various "documents" concerning the art of preaching, including instructions on the proper method of breathing.

The object of the Rev. J. Burke's little book on *The Reasonableness of Catholic Ceremonies and Practices* (Benziger, 1s. net.) is to show that the various symbolic rites that are so prominent in the public worship of the Church have an obvious foundation in the composite nature of man, and that various "practices" which distinguish it, including devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and to our Lady, Confession, Prayers for the Dead, Infant Baptism, Celibacy of the Clergy, &c., have all abundant motives to justify them taken from reason alone. A useful book for converts under instruction.

Only a word here and there betrays the fact that the priest in *A Hill of Joy*, by M. A. S. (Rebman, 6d. net.) is not a Catholic but an Anglican. For the rest, his experiences might well be those of a devoted Catholic Rector in the East End. He feels, for all his sixty years, a longing for present joy and material happiness, and then fatigued with over-work sees in a sort of dream-vision the spiritual realities that underlie the sordid appearances and conditions around him. The short allegory is delicately and beautifully written with much spiritual insight.

The Blessed Grignon de Montfort made himself in an especial way an apostle of devotion to our Lady. One of his little pious treatises, discovered not long ago, has been translated and published in English under the title of *The Secret of Mary unveiled to the Devout Soul* (Art and Book Co.



6d. net.). No Catholic can fail to understand and profit by the teaching of this booklet : but had the author lived amid non-Catholic surroundings, he would perhaps have felt the necessity of modifying or qualifying some expressions which might easily be misunderstood.

For the better guidance and support of the faithful, the Church by her positive legislation has determined to some extent the natural obligation incumbent on all to avoid the unnecessary occasions of sin which are brought about by the reading of books against Faith or Morals. Father Bessen, S.J., in *The Roman Index of Forbidden Books* (Sands, 1s. 6d. net.), has published a short and clear explanation of the Church's action in this matter, on what grounds it is based, and how it affects the conscience.

The Rev. Father Kirwan has edited, and Messrs. Sands have published, two penny pamphlets called *Heavenward*, with the object of bringing more before the notice of Catholics the heroism of the English Martyrs. The various Lives are taken from Challoner's *Memoirs*, and Father Gibson's *Lives of the Saints*, with sundry alterations and additions.

*The Catholic Directory of British South Africa for 1909* gives an edifying record of the state and labours of the Church in that part of the Empire. It appears that the number of Secular and Regular priests at work in the various Vicariates is about 260, aided, of course, by a greater number of brothers and nuns. The note on p. l. with regard to Mixed Marriages should be amended in view of recent legislation. Mixed Marriages without dispensation are now not only unlawful but invalid.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

*Allen, London :*

SOCIALISM, IS IT LIBERTY OR TYRANNY? By Bernard Vaughan, S.J. Pp. 61. Price, 6d. net. 1909.

*Art and Book Co, London :*

THE SECRET OF MARY: By the Blessed L. M. de Montfort. New Edition. Pp. 86. Price, 6d. net. 1909.

*Ave Maria Press, Indiana :*

DANGERS OF THE DAY: By Mgr. Canon Vaughan. Pp. vi, 239. Price, \$1.00. 1909.

*Benziger Brothers, New York :*

FORGIVE AND FORGET: By Ernst Lingens. Pp. 350. Price, 5s. 1909.  
THE SUNDAY SCHOOL DIRECTOR'S GUIDE TO SUCCESS: By Rev. P. Sloan. Pp. xxiv, 271. Price, 4s. net. 1909. REASONABLENESS OF CATHOLIC CEREMONIES: By Rev. J. J. Burke. 3rd Edition. Pp. v, 160. Price, 1s. net. 1909.

*Bloud, Paris :*

LEIBNITZ: By Jean Baruzi. Pp. 384. Price, 5.00 fr. 1909. LECONS SUR L'ART DE PRECHER: By F. Mourret. Pp. 450. Price, 5.00 fr. 1909. L'EXPERIENCE ESTHETIQUE ET L'IDEAL CHRETIEN: By Armand Loisel. Pp. 235. Price, 5.00 fr. 1909.

*Burns and Oates, Ltd., London :*

LITTLE ANGELS: By Father M. Russell, S.J. Pp. viii, 162. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1909.

*Cambridge University Press :*

ITALY FROM 1494 TO 1790: By Mrs. H. M. Vernon. Pp. viii, 516. Price, 5s. 6d. net. 1909.

*C.T.S., London :*

IN MEMORY OF CHRIST'S PASSION. Pp. 96. Price, 3d. (Cloth, 6d. net.) 1909. THE RELIGION OF UNITARIANISM : By G. S. Hitchcock. Price, 1d. THE RELIGION OF THE ATHENIAN PHILOSOPHERS : By H. Browne, S.J. Price, 1d.

*Constable, London :*

PLATO : By A. E. Taylor. Pp. 150. Price, 1s. net. 1908. BERKELEY AND SPIRITUAL REALISM : By A. C. Fraser. Pp. 85. Price, 1s. net. 1908.

*Gabalda et Cie., Paris :*

LA VENERABLE ANNE-MARIE JAVOUHEY : Par V. Caillard. 2me. Edit. Pp. 223. Price, 2.00 fr. 1909. VIE DE SAINT EUTHYME LE GRAND : Par P. Fr. Raymond Génier, O.P. Pp. xxxii, 302. Price, 4.00 fr. 1909.

*Herder, Fribourg :*

ELEMENTA PHILOSOPHIAE SCHOLASTICAE : Auctore Dr. S. Reinstadler. 2 vols. Fourth Edition. Pp. xxvii, 482 ; xviii, 467. Price, 7.50 fr. 1909.

*Letouzey et Ané, Paris :*

HISTOIRE ET SAGESSE D'AHIKAR L'ASSYRIEN : By François Nau. Pp. 308. Price, 5s. 1909.

*Longmans, Green, and Co., London :*

ECCLESIA DISCENS : By the Rev. James Peile. Pp. viii, 303. Price, 5s. net. 1909. THE DAWN OF THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL IN ENGLAND, 1781—1803 : By Mgr. B. Ward. 2 vols. Pp. xxviii, 370 ; viii, 316. Price, 25s. net. 1909. A HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST : By Darwell Stone, M.A. 2 Vols. Pp. xii, 410 ; x, 644. Price, 30s. net.

*The Macmillan Co., New York :*

THE SAYINGS OF BUDDHA : By J. H. Moore, A.M. Pp. xii, 142. Price, \$1.50. 1909.

*Methuen, London :*

THE CREED IN THE EPISTLES : By Wilfrid Richmond. Pp. xviii, 114. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1909. THE SAXON CHURCH AND THE NORMAN CONQUEST : By C. T. Cruttwell, M.A. Pp. xvi, 268. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1909. THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH : By J. H. Maude, M.A. Pp. xi, 231. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1909.

*Rebman, London :*

THE HILL OF JOY : By M. A. S. Pp. 20. Price, 6d. net. 1909.

*Salesian Press, Cape Town*

THE CATHOLIC DIRECTORY OF BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA for 1909. Pp. 108. Price, 1s. net.

*Sands and Co., London :*

THE ROMAN INDEX OF FORBIDDEN BOOKS : By F. S. Bessen, S.J. Pp. 69. Price, 1s. 6d. net. 1909. THE PATH WHICH LED A PROTESTANT LAWYER TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH : By Peter H. Burnett. Pp. xxii, 425. Price, 5s. net. 1909. FREQUENT AND DAILY COMMUNION, EVEN FOR MEN : By F. M. de Zulueta, S.J. Pp. 23. Price, 1d. NOT FOR THIS WORLD ONLY : By Frances Noble. Pp. 173. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1909. THE DECREE ON DAILY COMMUNION : By F. J. Ferreres, S.J. Pp. 168. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1909. REPORT OF THE NINETEENTH EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS AT WESTMINSTER. Pp. xxiii, 684. Price, 5s. net. 1909.

*Wagner, New York :*

PHASES OF THE SACRED PASSION : By Rev. William Graham. Pp. 58. Price, \$0.40. 1909.

## SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS.

### Summary of Contents.

#### I.

##### Studien und Mittheilungen.

(1908). IV.

*A. Stieger.*—St. Bernard of Clairvaux.

*J. Paech.*—The History of the Abbey of Lubin.

*F. Bliemetzrieder.*—Mathäus Clementis's Report to Urban VI.

*F. Lauchert.*—Isidorus Clarius and the Religious Strife of the Reformation Period.

*G. A. Weber.*—The Tomb of St. Emmeram.

*O. Stark.*—The Miracle of St. Januarius.

*G. Holtum.*—The Grounds of Celibacy.

#### II.

##### Der Katholik. (1909). III.

*M. Bierbaum.*—A Modern Saint (St. Francis of Assisi).

*J. B. Metzler.*—The May Devotions to our Lady.

*A. Huppertz.*—The Controversy upon the Early Christian conception of Sacrifice.

*Andrew Schmid.*—The Importance of Liturgical Studies.

#### III.

##### Le Canoniste Contemporain.

(1909). II.

*P. Fournet.*—The Reform of the Roman Curia. The Congregation of the Holy Office.

*A. Boudinhon.*—The History of the Penitenzieria.

Recent Roman Documents.

#### IV.

##### Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique (1909). I.

*J. Flamion.*—The Apocryphal Acts of St. Peter.

*J. Mahé.*—Sanctification according to St. Cyril of Alexandria.

*A. Fierens.*—The Franciscan Question.

*J. Rois.*—The Catholic Church under Catherine II. of Russia.

#### V.

##### La Civiltà Cattolica. March 6 and 20.

Joan of Arc.

Catherine II. and the Catholics of Russia.

The Camaldolese Monks.

Distributive Justice.

Moral Education in Japan.

The Cultus of St. Joseph in the Church.

Theosophy and the New Testament.

St. Anselm of Aosta and Eleventh Century Monasticism.

The classical "Orders" in ancient architecture.

#### VI.

##### Razon y Fe. March. (1909.)

*L. Murillo.*—The Holy See and the Book of Isaías.

*J. M. Aicardo.*—Lope de Vega as a Sacred Poet.

*U. de Ercilla.*—Modernist Philosophy.

*E. Portillo.*—The Divine and Human in History.

*E. Noguera.*—Co-operative Societies and State Aid.

*J. del Barrio.*—Ten Years of Radio-Activity.

#### VII

##### Revue Augustinienne. March. 1909.

*P. F. Merklen.*—The Modernity of St. Thomas.

*S. Salaville.*—The Epiclesis and the Roman Canon of the Mass.

*J. Derambure.*—The "Son of Man" in the Gospels.

*P. Poiteau.*—Prehistoric Man and the Discoveries of 1908.

